



Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 85th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 15, 1957

(Legislative day of Friday, April 12, 1957)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Dr. Robert E. Van Deusen, secretary, division of public relations, National Lutheran Council, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Spirit of God, descend upon our hearts, and take the dimness of our souls away. Give us the grace to face simply and honestly the issues that are before us.

Help us to think clearly, and not to permit the surge of emotions or the pressure of conflicting opinions to disturb our inner calm.

Open our ears to Thy voice speaking to us, and give us the courage to obey. Make our hearts and minds quiet before Thee, and our wills ready to do Thy bidding. In Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 12, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 2367. An act to establish a deferred grazing program as part of the relief avail-

able to drought stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4271. An act to provide that the Delegate from Alaska in the House of Representatives of the United States may be a member of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission;

H. R. 6092. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Merrimack River flood control compact;

S. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to implement further the act of July 15, 1946, by approving the signature by the Secretary of the Treasury of an agreement amending the Anglo-American Financial Agreement of December 6, 1945; and

H. J. Res. 279. Joint resolution authorizing the procurement of an oil portrait and marble bust of the late Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until tomorrow at noon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to make a brief announcement. Because the unfinished business, House bill 5520, to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to increase the maximum interest rate permitted on United States savings bonds, is considered to be of immediate importance, and because, as reported by the Senate Finance Committee, the bill contains provisions substantially different from those adopted by the House of Representatives, in the case of interest rates, I ask the indulgence of Senators in scheduling the bill for action by the Senate prior to the holding of the morning hour today.

It is my intention to ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour immediately after the Senate completes action on House bill 5520.

It is not planned that any other bill will be considered today. However, the Senate will meet tomorrow; and it is hoped that at that time the Senate will be able to proceed to the consideration of the following measures:

Calendar No. 181, Senate bill 1034, to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the University of Missouri for agricultural purposes certain real property in Callaway County, Mo.

Calendar No. 217, Senate Joint Resolution 12, relating to the Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir project.

Calendar Nos. 226 to 231, which are six bills reported from the Senate Finance Committee, and not believed to be controversial.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In addition to the measures which have been mentioned, if the House of Representatives acts today on the deficiency appropriation bill, which contains the Post Office Department appropriation, and if the bill comes to the Senate, and if the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations is able to have a hearing on the bill tomorrow morning and is able to report the bill at that time, then, in the event the Senate gives unanimous consent for that purpose, I hope that bill, which contains the Post Office Department appropriation, will be considered promptly by the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I assure the distinguished minority leader that, so far as I am concerned, we shall cooperate with him to the best of our ability.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Montana.

INCREASE OF INTEREST RATE ON UNITED STATES SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5520) to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to increase the maximum interest rate permitted on United States Savings Bonds, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment on page 1, line 9, after the word "of", to strike out "3½" and insert "3.26."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Robert P. Mayo, chief of the debt division of the Treasury Department, be given the privilege of the floor of the Senate while the unfinished business (H. R. 5520) is being considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to give a brief explanation of House bill 5520.

The bill raises the maximum permissible interest rates on Government savings bonds to 3.26 percent. In recent months the sales of savings bonds have been decreasing, and redemptions increasing, primarily because general interest rates have gone up considerably while the rate of returns on savings bonds has changed by only one-tenth of one point since the first E-bonds were sold in 1941. The monthly redemptions of savings bonds have exceeded sales for every month since August of 1956. Sales have not exceeded redemptions by any substantial amount in any single month since March of 1956.

In a public statement on February 14, 1957, the Treasury announced plans to increase the interest rates on series E and series H savings bonds. This would be done by selling a series E savings bond at the same price which is presently charged, but with a shorter maturity. For example, the \$100 bond would still be sold for \$75, but it would mature in 8 years and 11 months, compared with the present maturity time of 9 years and 8 months. The terms of the H-bond will be changed in the same fashion. An H-bond is broadly similar to an E-bond, except that interest is paid by check, instead of being postponed to maturity. The Treasury announced that the new maturity period, if approved by the necessary legislation, would be applied to all savings bonds sold after February 1, 1957.

The Finance Committee has given serious consideration to the Treasury request for raising the present maximum rate on savings bonds above the present 3 percent. We are bringing the bill to the floor with a certain amount of regret. Higher interest rates do increase the cost of carrying the public debt. In addition, higher interest rates make it difficult for small businesses and home owners to borrow funds to finance investments which are necessary for the prosperity of the national economy. We urge Senate support of this particular rate increase, however, because the rate on savings bonds is now considerably out of line with the general structure of interest rates. Even though some may feel that interest rates as a whole are too high, the sales of savings bonds will continue to lag unless the rate of interest they pay is made more nearly consistent with other rates.

The Finance Committee gave consideration to two other issues in connection with this increase. The first was the question of whether or not there should be greater flexibility for the Treasury to increase interest rates on savings bonds if inflationary pressure should build up in the future. The Treasury originally requested that the statute provide that the savings bonds rate could be raised to 4½ percent, even though they had only

announced plans to sell a 3¼ percent bond. The House bill would raise the ceiling only to 3½ percent. The Finance Committee has further reduced the new ceiling to 3.26 percent, which will be adequate to sell the bonds described in the Treasury announcement of February 14.

Let me say that the action of the Senate Finance Committee is an indication that the committee desires to discourage further increases in interest rates in financing Federal obligations. We felt strongly that the serious aspects of higher interest rates require that any further increase should be accompanied by a request for legislation. Experience in the past has indicated that the market for savings bonds declines slowly enough in an inflationary period as to afford ample time for additional legislation.

It is an important feature of this type of bonds, however, that individuals should have confidence in the rate of return. Many short-term fluctuations in the rate of returns would encourage individuals to withhold their purchases from time to time when there was reason to gamble on another increase. It is proper that the rate on bonds sold to the public should remain at an announced level for years, and not months.

I ask for the passage of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 5520) was read the third time and passed.

TRANSFER OF RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR YELLOWTAIL DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 217, Senate Joint Resolution 12, relating to Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 12) to provide for transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, and payment to Crow Indian Tribe in connection therewith, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may

be the usual morning hour, for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business, and that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF ARIZONA LEGISLATURE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relating to the appropriation of funds for the construction of a fish producing and rearing station in Sycamore Canyon, north of Cottonwood, Ariz., and in the area of Bullhead City, Ariz.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 4

A joint memorial requesting the United States Congress to appropriate funds for the construction of a fish producing and rearing station in Sycamore Canyon north of Cottonwood, Ariz., and in the area of Bullhead City, Ariz.

To the Congress of the United States of America:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

It is generally agreed that fish producing and rearing stations in Sycamore Canyon north of Cottonwood, Ariz., and another in the Bullhead City area would be beneficial to the residents of Arizona. Production facilities in this State are limited, and available money and locations for additional fish hatcheries from State funds are improbable.

Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, prays that the Congress of the United States is requested to give its most earnest consideration to provide an adequate appropriation for the specific purpose of constructing a fish producing and rearing station in Sycamore Canyon north of Cottonwood, Ariz., and another in the area of Bullhead City, Ariz. The exact location shall be determined by the recommendations of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 70) requesting the President to proclaim the week of April 28 to May 4, 1957, inclusive, as National Mental Health Week, reported it favorably, without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 233) thereon.

CITATION OF EDWARD A. HINTZ FOR CONTEMPT OF SENATE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report an original resolution, citing Edward A. Hintz for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 232) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 124) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Edward A. Hintz to answer questions before the Committee on Banking and Currency, said questions being pertinent to the question under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, to the end that the said Edward A. Hintz may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,
The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Caleb R. Layton III, of Delaware, to be United States district judge for the district of Delaware, vice Richard S. Rodney, retired.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 1876. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real-estate investment trusts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1877. A bill for the relief of Louis G. Whitcomb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 1878. A bill for the relief of Choi Ok Ja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1879. A bill for the relief of Casey Jimenez;

S. 1880. A bill for the relief of Joaquin A. Bazan;

S. 1881. A bill for the relief of Lin Tsai Lin; and

S. 1882. A bill for the relief of Ling Chi Yuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1883. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to increase to \$800 the amount of each personal exemption allowed as a deduction for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1884. A bill to amend section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1885. A bill for the relief of David Forbes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were reported or submitted, and placed on the calendar, or referred, as indicated:

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 124) citing Edward A. Hintz for contempt of the Senate, which was placed on the calendar.

(See resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY OF METHODS OF PROVIDING AN OVERALL FEED PROGRAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to make a study of methods of providing an overall feed program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 125) submitted by Mr. SYMINGTON, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is requested to conduct a thorough study of possible methods of providing an overall feed grain program which can be made effective with the 1958 crop, and to report thereon with specific recommendations, including drafts of necessary legislation to carry out such recommendations, not later than July 15, 1957.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last week the Senate considered and defeated S. 1771, a 1957 corn bill.

I supported it for two reasons. First, I thought it offered an improvement over the existing laws as they relate to corn. Secondly, I wanted to see action taken during this session that would seek a more permanent solution to the overall feed-grain problem.

In my statement on the Senate floor last week, I pointed out the close relationship between feed-grain supplies and livestock prices. Legislation that deals successfully with the feed grains, in reality, deals with the entire agricultural economy.

Corn is only one of several crops which are used almost exclusively as feed for livestock. The other feed grains—barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums—are excellent substitutes for corn.

The committee report accompanying S. 1771 stated:

Testimony during the hearings indicated that one of the difficulties of making a corn program effective was the shifting of acreage to alternative feed grains not under any control. Witnesses from each farm organization participating in the hearing, while differing as to method, supported the idea that Congress and the Department of Agriculture must consider the total feed-grain supply, recognizing the alternate use of different feeds. Even the Department of Agriculture's witness emphasized the problem was not corn alone, but the total feed-grain supply.

Lateness of the season made it appear impractical to place a new overall feed-grain program into effect this year. For that reason the committee expressed the hope increased corn participation in the soil bank under this bill in 1957 would help reduce the total feed supply to some extent, but nevertheless felt a start should be made at once toward the broader objective of seeking to bring the total feed supply into better balance with demand.

Part of the difficulty encountered by Congress in working out a satisfactory program for feed grains in 1956, and again this year, resulted from a lack of data. The report required of the Secretary by the bill should therefore include all such historic data as may be obtained to assist Congress in working out a satisfactory program.

Since the proposed corn bill, S. 1771, was defeated last week, the Department of Agriculture has no direction from Con-

gress to conduct this feed-grain study. Therefore, I submit this resolution, requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to make a thorough study of the possible methods of providing an overall feed grain program and to report his findings and recommendations to Congress no later than July 15, 1957.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO AN INCREASE OF PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS FOR INCOME-TAX PURPOSES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to increase to \$800 the amount of each personal exemption allowed as deduction for income-tax purposes. I realize that Senators may not introduce measures concerning revenue, since such measures must originate in the House of Representatives. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance, so that the committee may be studying this matter before the first revenue bill comes over from the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1883) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to increase to \$800 the amount of each personal exemption allowed as a deduction for income-tax purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HUMANITARIAN AND OLD-AGE RIGHTS ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 4, 1957,

The names of Senators KEFAUVER, MAGNUSON, CLARK, LANGER, and CHAVEZ were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1793) to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to eliminate certain inequities and restrictions and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. PASTORE), on April 4, 1957.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by him entitled "Asian Assembly for Moral Rearmament," with reference to the recent Asian Assembly for Moral Rearmament meeting in the Philippine Islands.

Statement by him on H. R. 6790 and H. R. 6791, proposed bills relating to natural gas.

COMMENTS BY DAVE BECK, PRESIDENT OF THE TEAMSTERS' UNION, ON "THE ANTILABOR TIDE"

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the April 1957, issue of the International

Teamster crossed my desk this morning, and I wish to take this opportunity to comment on a letter from General President Dave Beck entitled "The Antilabor Tide."

Mr. Beck has recently achieved a dubious distinction among labor leaders for his constant use of the fifth amendment while a witness before the Select Committee on Improper Practices in the Labor or Management Field, and, in light of his reluctance to assist the committee with its work, I should like to quote from his letter.

The average workingman or woman is willing and anxious to do the right thing. He wants labor's house cleaned up wherever and whenever it needs cleaning.

Mr. President, does this statement ring true, coming from a man who refused to give a Senate committee any information whatsoever about his financial dealings while president of the largest member union of the AFL-CIO? Apparently Mr. Beck is speaking only for the average workingman or woman and not for himself, the master financial manipulator, who possesses the very real advantage of having other people's money to manipulate. Mr. Beck has shown no inclination to do the right thing in his appearances before the Select Committee Investigating Improper Practices in the Labor or Management Field.

Mr. Beck continues in his letter, in commenting on the recent passage of a right-to-work law in Indiana:

And also in Indiana we hear a boast of a "slush" fund of \$360,000, to achieve the objectives of repressing labor's rights.

This statement, also, needs a little examination due to the fact that Mr. Beck's chief lieutenant, Frank Brewster, sometime labor leader, but more often race horse owner, testified that the Western Conference of Teamsters spent \$500,000 to defeat a right-to-work initiative in the State of Washington. This figure was later boosted to \$1,080,000 by Howard Sylvester, executive secretary of one of the citizens committees which Mr. Brewster set up to defeat the right-to-work measure. Regardless of the exact figure spent, it is obvious that Mr. Beck is speaking out of the side of his mouth when he registers mock indignation at any sort of "slush funds." I suspect that the only thing that bothered Mr. Beck was the fact that he was unable to borrow from this fund, interest free.

There is one statement Mr. Beck makes in his letter to the membership of the International, with which I am completely in accord. In speaking of the "reactionary forces at work against labor," Mr. Beck comments:

It may cost us each as individuals as Gompers said, to be associated with a labor organization.

How prophetic this statement is. So far it has cost the rank and file teamsters millions of dollars to support their erstwhile leaders in the manner to which they have become accustomed during the past decade. This money went for such items as transportation charges for Mr. Brewster's jockey and horse trainer, repairs on Mr. Brewster's horse van, investments in racing stables, interest free

loans to Mr. Beck, \$14 neckties, expenses for known gamblers, Mr. Beck's golf clubs, his love seat, his solid silver gravy boat, his electric razors, and other items too various and bizarre to mention. Yes, Mr. President, it will cost the average teamster plenty to take care of Mr. Beck, Mr. Brewster, and their closely knit clan of associates.

One last comment, Mr. President, on Mr. Beck's stirring message to the rank and file of his organization. Mr. Beck, in commenting on the road ahead, says:

We must continue to carry out our main function—our principal function—perhaps our only really important function: the meeting with management at the collective-bargaining table and there facing our problems.

The select committee has heard dozens of witnesses and amassed some 3,426 pages of testimony, and, Mr. President, I defy Mr. Beck to point out one instance in which any member of the committee has criticized any representative of labor for carrying out this principal function of meeting with management at the collective-bargaining table. Mr. President, no Member of the Senate has more often been characterized as antilabor than has the junior Senator from Arizona and, yet, I defy Mr. Beck or Mr. Reuther or any other labor leader to point out an instance where I have been critical of labor leadership for carrying out this function.

Mr. President, the record of the Select Committee Investigating Improper Practices in the Labor or Management Field is replete with instances of labor leaders in the teamsters union having strayed far beyond the purposes for which labor unions were originally formed. No evidence has been presented to refute the allegations that teamster officials in Portland, Oreg., conspired to control the rackets in that city; no evidence has been offered to refute testimony and documents pointing out the fact that loans were made from teamster funds to set up poker palaces and bookie joints; Mr. Beck has certainly offered no evidence to refute the allegations that he borrowed some \$340,000 from the teamster funds and neglected to pay any interest on this amount; no evidence has been offered to refute allegations that Mr. Brewster has used some \$700,000 of teamster funds to meet his own personal obligations; nor has any evidence been offered to explain the purchases with union money of some \$87,000 worth of goods for Mr. Beck by Mr. Nathan Shefferman.

Mr. President, I have one suggestion to make to Mr. Beck, and that is, if he would confine himself to his activities at the bargaining table there would be no need for self-serving, patently ridiculous letters such as the one in the April issue of the teamster magazine.

PROPOSED COMMISSION ON FEDERAL TAXATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation noted with interest the news last Friday that the Senate Finance Committee had unanimously voted to undertake a review of the financial condition of the

United States, including interest rates, revenues, and the handling of the public debt.

We know that this review, under the chairmanship of our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], can and will make a most important contribution to America's reappraisal of this most vital subject.

I personally noted with particular interest the comments made by our able colleague from Virginia in response to a question as to the relation between this review by the Finance Committee, and the subject of tax revision.

I noted that our colleague indicated that in the expected course of the committee's review, some tax questions would indeed be considered. He commented further that one question which would probably come up is the size of tax load the Nation can bear if the free-enterprise system is to survive.

VIRTUAL UNANIMITY IN FAVOR OF WILEY TAX BILL

Mr. President, I should like to point out that for several months I have been stressing the advisability of a top-to-bottom review of the Nation's tax structure.

Along with 14 cosponsors, I introduced the Wiley bill, S. 769, for a Hoover-style Federal Tax Commission.

As I have previously reported in the Senate, this Wiley bill has drawn practically unanimous acclaim among expert observers throughout the Nation.

I have previously had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of many comments which have come to me from leading business spokesmen throughout the United States, from corporation heads and chairmen of boards, as well as from other prominent individuals whose reactions I had sought.

I send to the desk several additional such replies from outstanding business leaders. I include the text of a letter which I received just this morning from the executive director of the Chamber of Commerce of the great city of Pittsburgh, advising that the directors of the chamber have approved this bill.

I submit the text of an editorial from the Monroe, Wis., Times, likewise approving the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters and the editorial be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF PITTSBURGH,
Pittsburgh, Pa., April 11, 1957.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh wish to thank you for introducing S. 769 which would establish a Hoover-type commission to study and investigate the fundamental tax policy and tax structure of the Federal Government.

M. C. Conick, chairman of the Federal finance committee of the chamber's national affairs council, in recommending support of this bill to the board of directors, said:

"The Federal finance committee believes that this bill is for the good of our growing

Nation, and, in view of the present tremendous Federal tax take from the taxpayers, that it is especially desirable at this time that our entire tax structure be reviewed, studied and investigated by the Commission provided for in Senator WILEY's bill S. 769."

The Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh subscribes wholeheartedly to these views and congratulates you for initiating legislation which can bring about greatly needed reforms in our Federal tax system.

We are notifying our Pennsylvania Senators and Representatives from Allegheny County of our support for your bill.

Sincerely yours,

SHERMAN P. VOORHEES,
Executive Director.

DOUGLAS AIRCRAFT CO., INC.,
Santa Monica, Calif., March 7, 1957.
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We agree heartily with the purpose of this bill and believe that the composition of the commission you propose would be excellent for the purpose of taking a new overall look at this country's tax structure. We hope that your proposal will meet with success.

With every good wish, I am

Very truly yours,

FREDERICK E. HINES,
Vice President, Finance and Tax Counsel.

UNITED FRUIT CO.,
Boston, Mass., March 8, 1957.
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I believe your suggestion could be quite useful, particularly if it was directed at the point of taxation for revenue rather than taxation for social purposes. There are many cases where the tax rates are definitely too high for proper collection of revenue and serve only to destroy initiative. This is particularly evident in the very high rates for large incomes.

On the other hand, I have not got much confidence in the result of a study placed purely on taxation. In my mind, the great evil of today's Government in Washington is the spending rather than the taxation, and I would far prefer to see a commission to discuss expenditures with a point of view of putting more of the burden back on the States and on the foreign countries. I do not feel that our Federal Government should subsidize the whole world and I am very fearful of the results of what is now going on. This is particularly in evidence where spending for State purposes may force greater expenditures than the States would care to spend if they had a free hand. As you can understand, I am a believer in government economy.

If I can be of any use to you, I will be only too glad to do what I can, and I appreciate your interest in this subject.

Sincerely,

T. JEFFERSON COOLIDGE.

KOPPERS CO., INC.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., March 15, 1957.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Committee on Judiciary,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I was very pleased indeed to receive your communication concerning S. 769, designed to create a 12-man Hoover-type commission on Federal taxation.

I have, of course, been greatly disturbed by the continuance of high income-tax rates which result in corporate taxpayers paying to the Government more than half their earn-

ings. I know of no informed person who attempts to justify this situation. Nevertheless, we have had a rash of bills introduced in this session of Congress for the purpose of granting relief to small business, but which would accomplish this by an even higher tax rate on "big" corporations. I refer particularly to the Fulbright bill (S. 150), which I understand Senator FULBRIGHT and others intend to offer as an amendment to H. R. 4090 when it reaches the Senate. Even more objectionable proposals have been offered by Senator SPARKMAN, Representative PATMAN, and others which would call for a graduated corporate income tax.

Even at the present level of corporate tax rates, the burden is so heavy that business transactions must always be guided by tax results, and very often the tax system operates to prevent what business intelligence would otherwise require.

It may well be that "small" business needs tax relief, but it does seem to me that any attempt to solve the problem by granting relief merely to small corporations at the expense of the larger units is entirely futile, since only a narrow segment of the small businesses of the country operate as corporations. Representative DANIEL REED recently stated that only about 15 percent of the small businesses of the country operate in the corporate form.

I mention these facts because they have a bearing on your proposal for a Hoover-type commission to examine the entire question of taxation. I am strongly in favor of such a commission and hope that it may dramatize and bring to popular attention obvious defects in our present system of taxation which proponents of higher taxes for "big" corporations almost always ignore.

I therefore want to give my strongest support to your proposal and wish you success in this laudable effort to promote a sensible examination of this most important factor in today's economic life.

Sincerely yours,

FRED C. FOY.

[From the Monroe (Wis.) Times of
February 20, 1957]

SENATOR WILEY'S IDEA

There is considerable merit and potential for tremendous service to the Nation's citizens in Senator WILEY's proposal for establishing a Federal Tax Commission.

This 12-member group would study the entire Federal tax structure and make recommendations for changes to improve the programs and to correct inequalities.

It also is highly possible that such a commission might provide the much-needed clearinghouse for giving recognition to the growing revolt against the continued increase in Government spending.

There are some, of course, who do not concede that such a rebellion against big Government is under way. We merely point to the deluge of mail being received by Members of Congress in the wake of the record \$72-billion budget proposal as the best possible evidence that the opposition to spending is gaining momentum.

In connection with his proposal, Senator WILEY has polled many industrial leaders for their reaction to the Federal Tax Commission plan. The early replies indicate these leaders are heartily in favor of the plan.

One of them, the head of a giant automobile firm, pointed out some tax facts which have been largely overlooked. Since 1939, he said, Congress has been faced with one emergency after another requiring additional revenues. Main consideration, he contends, has been given to finding taxes to yield those revenues without regard to the long-range effect of the tax structure being created.

The procedure for levying these taxes in many cases, this industrialist claims, has

resulted in pyramiding them for the ultimate consumer. In the case of an automobile, the total of taxes attached to the retail price is likely to be as much as 30 percent.

Another industrialist wrote Senator WILEY that the "only body of law which affects each of us in practically everything we do is the tax law."

"Directly, or indirectly," he added, "the tax law can influence what we eat, where we live, what we wear, what we do for a living, even what we do for entertainment."

Most of us will agree with that. By design or by accident, tax laws actually are governing the people more than anything else.

DOUBTFUL IF COMMITTEE CAN FULLY STUDY TAXES

Mr. WILEY. I fully recognize, of course, the outstanding competence of my colleagues on the Finance Committee, especially the expertness of the chairman of that committee, who has devoted so many years to this subject, and who is undoubtedly one of the great tax experts in the land. Nevertheless, I still hope that a 12-man Citizens Commission of the type recommended by the Wiley bill, may be appointed.

I believe that such a group, relieved of the day-to-day pressures of legislation, could take the long-range look of the type I have recommended. As outlined in the Record of January 22, the Commission would have until January 1, 1959, to make its final report.

Of course, in the meantime, whatever the Senate Finance Committee can do by way of appraisal of parts of our tax structure, will be welcome.

NINE HUNDRED BILLIONS OF DEBT TO BE STUDIED

But in view of the enormous area to be covered in the course of the Finance Committee's review, I doubt if it will find the time to give to the tax phase as much attention as I am sure my colleagues would agree it deserves.

The committee may, for example, have its hands full, looking at the debt problem alone—America's \$900 billion of debt, two-thirds of which is private, one-third public.

TODAY IS FEDERAL TAX DEADLINE

I hope, therefore, that the Wiley bill can still be acted upon, in view of its tremendous significance to 60 million taxpayers who, on this very day, April 15, are due to file their 1956 Federal tax returns. The Wiley bill constitutes, in my humble judgment, the most promising single avenue for fundamental, long-range tax reform.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII AND ALASKA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Within a few short weeks the enabling bills, now pending in committee, which will, if passed, grant statehood to the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, will be debated upon the floor of the Senate. The fate of these measures, in my opinion, will depend upon the type of effort made by the President of the United States in support of them. For this reason I wrote a letter

to the President and delivered it last Friday. The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,

April 12, 1957.

The President,

The White House.

MR. PRESIDENT: On November 23, 1956, shortly following my election to the United States Senate, I wrote to you concerning a highly important bipartisan matter, our foreign policy. In that letter, I pledged my support, within the full limits of my convictions, to your efforts to keep the peace, and I have already had occasion, by vote in the Senate, to honor that pledge.

Today, I feel obliged to write you about another vital bipartisan matter, statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. The platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties have long supported statehood for the two Territories, and the cause has your personal endorsement. Yet, for reasons quite apart from the merits of the cause, I am fearful that statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska will once again fail of enactment in the Congress, unless you actively undertake to support your endorsement with the full potential of your high office.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have participated in the hearings, recently concluded, on the statehood bills. I am also a cosponsor of these bills. The evidence presented at the hearings makes the case for statehood so compelling that our continued failure to grant it will soon be regarded as a denial of the very tradition that has made our country strong and great. As measured by every historic test, the people of Hawaii and Alaska have qualified for statehood for many years. Again and again, they have petitioned the Congress, but each time to no avail. Now, at the outset of your second term as President, they come once more to seek their rights, and they need your help.

It is clear, from past years, that your endorsement of statehood alone will not suffice. But it is my conviction, as well as that of many other advocates of statehood in the Congress, that if you will personally undertake to champion the cause of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, and give the pending bills your determined and persistent support, both bills will pass, and statehood will be won in this session of the Congress.

That you will take up this fight, and assert the needed leadership that only a President can give, is the earnest hope of the great host of American citizens in Hawaii and Alaska, who ask only that they be granted the elemental rights for which we once fought a revolution, and long regarded as the prerogatives of free men.

Respectfully,

FRANK CHURCH.

RIGHTS OF FEDERAL WORKERS

MR. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to place in the body of the Record a story written on April 10 by Joseph Young, the able Government columnist of the Washington Star. Mr. Young has revealed a shocking attitude on the part of the administration toward its employees. The Justice Department, the legal arm of the administration, takes the position that Federal employees are not entitled to the benefits enjoyed by workers in private industry. It holds that the main factor in determining what Federal Employees are entitled to in the way of benefits and working conditions is economy. In other words, the Justice Department feels that the rights and benefits of Federal work-

ers are to be determined, not on the basis of what is fair and just and right, but on the basis of the almighty dollar.

No wonder there is such a glaring need for a labor-management law in Government. With such a horse and buggy, 19th century view of Federal employee rights taken by the Government, it is imperative that Congress approve legislation giving Government workers and their representatives the right to deal with their bosses on personnel policy matters and grievances.

Now that the Justice Department's views have been disclosed for everyone to see, the Department is trying to say that its position is misunderstood. But everyone who reads the Department's legal brief stating its position toward Federal workers can come to only one conclusion: The Justice Department has relegated Federal workers to the status of second-class citizenship. Its position on Government workers reads like the views of an industrial baron of 100 years ago.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the Record at this point the article to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JUSTICE BRIEF PUTS ECONOMY ABOVE BENEFITS—SAVINGS GET PRIORITY OVER GOVERNMENT WORK CONDITIONS

(By Joseph Young)

A Justice Department brief contends that benefits for Federal workers such as overtime, better pay and improved working conditions "must either bow to or be balanced with considerations of economy and efficiency in Government."

For example, the brief said, Congress, in the interests of Government economy, would be justified in setting a 10-hour workday for Federal employees.

The Department's brief was filed in answer to a test suit by a group of postal workers in the United States Court of Claims seeking overtime payments for extra time involved in studying postal sorting schemes.

The Department's brief, which presumably represents the administration's view, did not state that the administration feels that the Government's 8-hour day should be increased to 10 hours at this time. But it emphasized that such an increase in working hours would be justified in the name of economy if it should become necessary.

LIKE BENEFITS CHALLENGED

The brief emphasized the view that Federal workers, because of economy and Government efficiency considerations, are not entitled to the benefits of workers in private industry.

Federal employee leaders have denounced the Justice Department's views as "a throw-back to the horse-and-buggy days."

The "horse and buggy" comment was made by Thomas G. Walters, operations director of the AFL-CIO Government Employees Council.

"This attitude is a striking example of the archaic labor policy that the Government adopts for its own employees," Mr. Walters declared. "It emphasizes the need for a management-labor relations law in Government."

Roy Hallbeck, legislative representative of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, said "the Justice Department's view is the 19th century version of employee rights." James A. Campbell, president of the American Federation of Government Employees, said "the Government's position is the most

discouraging development to Federal employees in a long, long time. But it emphasizes the necessity of getting Congress to approve legislation officially recognizing the rights of Federal employees to better their working conditions."

HOME STUDY INVOLVED

The test case, which is being handled by the law firm here of Herbert S. Thatcher, involves postal workers who must study at home to memorize the routing of mail. The postal workers contend that industry in portal-to-portal agreements with labor unions now pays overtime for time spent by employees in preparation for their on-the-job duties or in traveling from one site to another in connection with a job.

The Justice Department's answer, in part to these claims, declares:

"Plaintiffs—the postal clerks—complaint is that they are not, but should be, paid for the time they spend within the confines of their own homes learning and keeping up with their jobs. As they read the statutes designed to ameliorate working conditions and the case law growing out of those statutes, they should be compensated for what they term physical and mental exertion. Such compensation, they argue, would be entirely in accord with the philosophy of present-day labor law. The philosophy, if such it can be called, may conceivably control in dealings between union and management."

"However, as between Federal employees and their employer, the United States, this philosophy must either bow to or be balanced with considerations of economy and efficiency in Government. The basic rights of labor—the right to strike and the right to bargain collectively—cannot be afforded Federal employees consistently with the Federal obligation to the taxpayers to operate the Federal administration economically and efficiently. Government employee unions have never sought the right to strike and specifically forbid such strikes by its members in their constitutions."

"As stated, Congress, alone charged with the function and duty of establishing the rates of pay and the criteria of payment for Government employees, has always been aware of the necessity of economy in Government and where it has acted to ameliorate the working conditions of Federal employees, it has always acted cautiously and in conformity with its desire for Government economy."

"For example, while the 8-hour day was assured for labor by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 * * * the Federal employee first obtained the right to work only an 8-hour day in 1945 and then only by implication. * * * True time-and-one-half for overtime has been standard for labor for many years. And yet true time-and-one-half for overtime is still not available to the bulk of Federal employees."

DENIED OTHER GAINS

"These few examples illustrate that the many advances made by the labor movement are not, as a general matter, incorporated into the laws affecting Federal personnel. Clearly, the economical administration of Government precludes the immediate and total adoption by Congress of schemes such as automatic cost-of-living increases based on the consumer price index."

"If Congress desires that, insofar as it is possible, all workers in this country work only 8 hours a day, nevertheless Congress could, in its concern for Federal expenditures, require, and validly provide, that Federal employees work 10 hours a day."

"That Congress has chosen to limit the working day of most Federal employees to 8 hours a day, 7 years after it chose to limit the working day for most workers in this country, is no indication that Congress has also chosen to pay its employees industry or

private management wages or, in this case, overtime compensation, sometimes described as 'penalty pay,' for study over which Government has no control and on which it cannot check.

"For the fact of the matter is, as we have shown, that Congress has not always accepted for Federal employees the theories or rights of the labor movement in their entirety."

THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] for his forthright and factual explanation of the mess in the Post Office Department. I invite all my colleagues to read carefully the remarks of the Senator from Michigan, beginning at page 5583 in the Friday, April 12, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

At the moment of his remarks it was abundantly clear—as he stated—that someone had broken the law but there might be confusion in the minds of some concerning the identity of the culprit.

Mr. President, decision B-131361 of the Comptroller General of the United States, made public a few minutes after the Senator from Michigan concluded his remarks, identifies the culprits beyond further doubt.

The decision referred to states that actions of the Postmaster General are not "consistent with the spirit and purpose of the act," and further, "there could be no question but that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget had not complied with the requirements of subsection (c) (1) of the act."

I ask that the full text of the Comptroller General's decision be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The subsequent effort by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to explain his actions serves to prove that he is totally incompetent and should be removed from the high position he holds. His naive remarks remind me of the kindly old lady who called the police, when informed that a local and popular baseball player had stolen a base. She did not know the "score." By his own public admission, neither does Mr. Brundage, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

I do not wish to conclude these few remarks without thanking my good friend and able colleague, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] for his generous comments about me indeed, he was most generous, and I should like to have him to know how greatly I appreciate his kindness.

Mr. President, I ask that the decision be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the decision was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, April 12, 1957.

DEAR MR. POSTMASTER GENERAL: Your letter of April 4, 1957, requests a statement of our findings resulting from a study of the records of the Post Office Department to ascertain whether during fiscal year 1957 there has been a violation of the provisions of section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), commonly known as the

Antideficiency Act. An informal request for similar advice was received from a staff member of the House Appropriations Committee following the hearings March 26 and 27, and April 3, 1957, before the Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office Appropriations, on the Post Office Department's supplemental request for funds for Operations.

At the outset, we wish to explain that our review was made in a very limited time to obtain information readily available as to whether the Post Office Department had violated the Antideficiency Act. Because of the time limit, our review was restricted to a comparison of apportionments, by appropriation, approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the postal quarterly reporting periods ended October 19, 1956, and January 11, 1957, with obligations incurred for the same quarters as they appear in published statements of the Post Office Department. No overobligation of the apportionments for those quarters was revealed by this comparison. Results of operations for the postal quarter ending April 5, 1957, were not available at the time of our review.

We did not review the obligations under administrative subdivisions of funds within the apportionments, but we were informed that in the quarter ended October 19, 1956, funds allotted to 2 regional directors had been overobligated by \$27,613 and the required reports to the President and the Congress were made on February 14, 1957.

Your letter, however, and the committee inquiry request our findings as to whether the provisions of the Antideficiency Act were violated during fiscal year 1957. This requires consideration not only of the question as to whether the apportionments of the funds for the fiscal year 1957 were overobligated but also as to whether they were made in accordance with the provisions of that act, which provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

"(c) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this section, all appropriations or funds available for obligation for a definite period of time shall be so apportioned as to prevent obligation or expenditure thereof in a manner which would indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropriations for such periods: * * *

"(d) (2) Any appropriation available to an agency, which is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The head of each agency to which any such appropriation is available shall submit to the Bureau of the Budget information, in such form and manner and at such time or times as the Director may prescribe, as may be required for the apportionment of such appropriation.

"(e) (1) No apportionment or reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate shall be made except upon a determination by such officer that such action is required because of (A) any laws enacted subsequent to the transmission to the Congress of the estimates for an appropriation which require expenditures beyond administrative control; or (B) emergencies involving the safety of human life, the protection of property, or the immediate welfare of individuals in cases where an appropriation has been made to enable the United States to make payment of, or contributions toward, sums which are required to be paid to individuals either in specific amounts fixed by law or in accordance with formulae prescribed by law.

"(2) In each case of an apportionment or a reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate,

such officer shall immediately submit a detailed report of the facts of the case to the Congress. In transmitting any deficiency or supplemental estimates required on account of any such apportionment or reapportionment, reference shall be made to such report."

Since the Department's supplemental request for funds for fiscal year 1957 is limited to the appropriation for operations, what is said hereinafter is addressed to that appropriation.

The apportionments of that appropriation, with a possible exception of about \$2 million referred to on page 97 of the House hearings on the second urgent deficiency appropriation bill, 1957, do not appear to come within the exceptions set out in subsection (e) (1) above and, apparently, subsection (e) was not relied upon in making the apportionments. The communication transmitting the supplemental estimates to the Congress March 2, 1957, contains no reference to any detailed report to the Congress of the facts involved as required in subsection (e) (2), and the testimony in these hearings contains no indication of reliance upon subsection (e) (1) in making the apportionments.

The apportionment of appropriations to prevent deficiency or supplemental appropriations was first required in the amendment to section 3679, Revised Statutes, contained in section 4 of the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1257). Section 3679, Revised Statutes, was amended again by section 3 of the act of February 23, 1906 (34 Stat. 27, 48), and lastly by section 1211 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951 (64 Stat. 765). Each of these amendments was intended to reduce further the need for deficiency or supplemental appropriations.

Even prior to the complete revision of section 3679 in the General Appropriation Act, 1951, the Antideficiency Act was considered to require that appropriations be apportioned so as to prevent either a deficiency appropriation or the suspension or drastic curtailment of an activity for lack of funds. In House Report No. 221, 79th Congress, 1st session, on the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1945, it is stated:

"The committee met with instances which indicated either a lack of knowledge or an utter disregard of the so-called antideficiency law (31 U. S. C. 665), in that agencies reported overobligations during the first half of the current fiscal year to an extent which places the Congress in the position either of granting additional funds or forcing the curtailment of operations which in some cases would be unwise and harmful. That sort of practice cannot be continued, particularly when the Congress is in continuous session. It must be stopped."

In House Report No. 1817, 79th Congress, 2d session, on the second deficiency appropriation bill, 1946, it is stated:

"Instances have occurred where agencies do not actually incur deficiencies but proceed at an obligational rate which make necessary either a deficiency appropriation or the suspension or drastic curtailment of an activity for lack of funds. The committee does not propose to tolerate that practice any longer. It intends to see that the antideficiency law (31 U. S. C. 665) is observed in letter and spirit and shall expect the Bureau of the Budget to report quarterly, starting at the close of the first quarter of the next fiscal year, the title of any appropriation not being administered in accordance with the letter and spirit of such law, the reasons therefor, and the name and position of the official immediately responsible."

The foregoing quotation was referred to in a letter dated August 22, 1946, of the Assistant Chief, Estimates, Bureau of the Budget, to the Postmaster General, printed at page 116 of the Senate hearings on the second deficiency appropriation bill for 1947. As recorded on page 142 of those hearings,

the Subcommittee on Deficiencies, Senate Committee on Appropriations, after hearing testimony as to deficiencies which had occurred in the Post Office Department, requested the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office to review the problem and submit a report thereon.

The Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Acting Comptroller General jointly submitted a report on June 5, 1947, B-66949, to the Senate Committee on Appropriations with the understanding that the subcommittee desired recommendations (1) as to what can be done to control the use of appropriations so as to prevent the incurring of obligations at a rate which will lead to deficiency or supplemental appropriations or to curtailment of necessary activities if such appropriations are not made; and (2) to fix responsibility on those officers of the Government who incur deficiencies or obligate appropriations without proper authorization or at an excessive rate. Included in the report was a draft of legislation to accomplish those two purposes.

This draft of legislation to amend section 3679, Revised Statutes, with some revisions, was enacted as section 1211 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951. A section-by-section analysis of that proposed legislation appears on pages 6835-6836 of volume 96, part 5, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is stated in that analysis that subsection (1) (c) is "designed to insure that appropriations which are available for a fiscal year, or for other time periods—usually related to fiscal years—will not be obligated at a rate which would exhaust the appropriation prior to the end of the period for which the appropriation was made and thus result in a need for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation, or an increase in the authorization for administrative expenses of a corporation, or in drastic curtailment of the

activity for which the appropriation or authorization was made."

A drastic curtailment toward the close of a fiscal year of operations carried on under a fiscal year appropriation is a prima facie indication of a failure to so apportion an appropriation "as to prevent obligation or expenditure thereof in a manner which would indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropriations for such period." In our view, this is the very situation the amendment of the law in 1950 was intended to remedy. This view is entirely consistent with the views expressed in the joint report dated June 5, 1947, of the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office. In view thereof and the legislative history of the Antideficiency Act set out above, subsection (c) (1) of the act must be, and is, construed as a mandate of the Congress that fiscal year appropriations be so apportioned as to prevent obligation or expenditure thereof in a manner which would indicate the necessity for either a deficiency or supplemental appropriation or a drastic curtailment of the activity for which an appropriation is made.

The responsibility for making the apportionments is vested in the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by subsection (d) (2) of the act, which also requires the head of the agency concerned to submit to the Bureau of the Budget information, in such form and manner and at such time or times as the Director may prescribe, as may be required for the apportionment of the appropriation. The apportionment and reapportionments as made by the Bureau of the Budget for the appropriation "Operations, Post Office Department, 1957," including transfers and reimbursements, are set out below:

Date	1st quarter	2d quarter	3d quarter	4th quarter
June 13, 1956	\$624,306,000	\$547,611,000	\$473,766,000	\$474,909,000
July 10, 1956	623,429,500	546,988,100	473,112,100	474,255,700
July 13, 1956	630,429,500	546,988,100	469,612,100	470,755,700
Aug. 30, 1956	630,326,100	546,988,100	469,612,100	470,755,700
Oct. 4, 1956	635,326,100	551,988,100	469,612,100	470,755,700
Dec. 14, 1956	635,326,100	561,988,000	466,612,000	463,884,900
Jan. 11, 1957	635,326,100	561,988,000	464,612,000	463,884,900
Feb. 4, 1957	635,326,100	561,988,000	484,612,000	443,884,900

The Post Office Department operates on 4-week accounting periods adjusted at the beginning and end of the fiscal year. The first, second, third, and fourth quarter columns in the above table actually represent 4 (less 1 day), 3, 3, and 3 (plus 2 days) accounting periods of 4 weeks each. The significant reapportionments were made on July 13 and December 14, 1956, and February 4, 1957. On July 13, 1956, the first quarter was increased \$7 million and the third and fourth quarters were decreased \$3,500,000 each. On December 14, 1956, the second quarter was increased to \$10 million and the third and fourth quarters were further decreased by \$3 million and approximately \$7 million, respectively. On February 4, 1957, the third quarter was increased \$20 million and the fourth quarter was decreased by \$20 million. These 3 reapportionments decreased the fourth quarter apportionment by a total of approximately \$30,500,000, which resulted in the fourth quarter apportionment being \$40,727,100 less than the third quarter apportionment which covered 2 days less time.

The necessity for a deficiency appropriation has been acknowledged by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the President as evidenced by the transmittal on March 12, 1957, to the Congress of a request for additional funds for operations of the Post Office Department during the fiscal year 1957 in the amount of \$47 million, the amount of your request for that purpose as received by the Bureau of the Budget January 4, 1957,

before the date of the last reapportionment listed above. Also, you issued Postmaster General Order 56314, dated April 5, 1957, which would curtail the service of the Post Office Department in several respects if it becomes effective.

If it is determined by the Congress that the deficiency appropriation is necessary for operations or if the services of the Post Office Department are drastically curtailed in the event no deficiency appropriation is made, there could be no question but that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget had not complied with the requirements of subsection (c) (1) of section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended, title 31, United States Code, section 665. It should be noted, however, that the penal provision contained in subsection (i) (1) of the act is applicable only to violations of subsections (a), (b), or (h) of the act and not to subsection (c) (1).

The House hearings on the Post Office Department's request for supplemental funds for operations for 1957 show that, when the Department requested the reapportionment of its funds, it did so in the belief that the requested pattern of management of its funds for the fiscal year would result in the necessity for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation. Such action is not technically a violation of any specific provision of the Antideficiency Act. However, it is not consistent with the spirit and purpose of the act.

Copies of this letter are being sent to the House Committee on Appropriations, to Senator BYRD, and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE TO SCREEN REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION BY SENATOR WILLIAMS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, upon direct orders from Washington, instructions have been given to all the regional offices of the Bureau of Internal Revenue to be on the lookout for any inquiry of any nature received by them or any employee under their jurisdiction from Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

The following is a copy of the memorandum which was circulated in the State of Wisconsin as the result of this broad order:

If you receive any communications from Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS requesting information of any nature, it is requested that you immediately transmit them to me personally for reply.

It is also requested that you advise all employees in your division who may have occasion to prepare replies to correspondence of this matter.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Harrington, has confirmed having issued this broad order, and in commenting upon the circulation of this memorandum to all employees in the State of Wisconsin the Commissioner states:

He (the Director of the Milwaukee office), as well as I, deeply regret its occurrence, and we certainly hope that no inference can be drawn by you or anyone else that any improprieties were inferred by my request. We are greatly embarrassed that my request led to this incident.

Mr. Harrington further attempted to justify the issuance of this order and the circulation of the memorandum on the basis of economy and that they merely wished to supply any information requested from my office at a minimum cost.

Certainly this is a new approach to economy, and I have been advised that this is the first time in the history of the Department that such a memorandum containing such a personal reference to a Member of the United States Senate of the House of Representatives has ever been circulated.

Mr. Harrington excused this on the basis that his orders resulted from my having placed an inquiry with some of the regional offices asking the Directors for the amount of delinquent taxes in their offices as of X date and that he felt that such inquiries directed to the Washington office could be answered more economically.

Mr. Harrington's letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES TREASURY
DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, April 2, 1957.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This refers to your letter dated March 5, 1957, to Mr. George Reisl-

mer, district director at Milwaukee, requesting information regarding a memorandum which you quoted.

This quoted memorandum was circulated among revenue agents in Wisconsin, as you indicated. I would like to explain the circumstances leading up to it.

Recently, we received a request from you concerning employment tax deficiencies. Several of our district offices also received similar requests. In order to avoid duplication of effort and to furnish the information from one source, I asked that all such requests be referred to me for reply. My sole objective in doing this was to supply the information at a minimum cost.

This led to Mr. Reislimer's issuance of the memorandum to his chiefs of divisions. He did not intend that the memorandum be circulated, but unfortunately it was.

By that I presume he meant that I should not receive a copy of it.

He, as well as I, deeply regret its occurrence, and we certainly hope that no inference can be drawn by you or anyone else that any improprieties were inferred by my request. We are greatly embarrassed that my request led to this incident.

Mr. Reislimer has informed me that he is not aware that his office has ever received any inquiry from you.

Very truly yours,

RUSSELL C. HARRINGTON,
Commissioner.

In writing this letter I had asked Mr. Reislimer and the Commissioner to check their records to see if they could find that any inquiry I had ever sent could be considered by them as being of an improper nature, which would justify this action. I was advised that they were unable to find any such inquiry. In addition, they could not find that I had ever made any inquiry in the State of Wisconsin, or of Mr. Reislimer or anyone else in that division.

I am not criticizing the directors who circulated this memorandum. They were merely acting upon orders from the boss. I wish I could accept the excuse given by Mr. Harrington as being the real reason for the issuance of this broad order, but somehow I simply cannot believe that this is the full explanation, especially when we consider that as yet the order has not been rescinded.

Instead, I am more inclined to repeat what I have said on many occasions during the past several years—that perhaps Congress has been negligent in not having directed more attention to the affairs of this agency which handles all the revenue collected by the United States Government.

TRANSFER OF TITLE OF MIDWEST CLAYPAN EXPERIMENT STATION, MCCREDIE, MO.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, several months ago I accepted an invitation to speak Thursday evening, March 28, at Sikeston, Mo., at the eighth annual meeting of the Missouri Cotton Producers Association, one of the leading agricultural groups in Missouri. Among those being honored on that occasion was Mr. A. L. Story, of Charleston, Mo., a past president of the Missouri Cotton Producers Association and now president of the American Cotton Producers Association.

At the time I accepted the invitation, I did not know, of course, what the pending business of the Senate would be. Before leaving on Thursday noon, I checked in the Senate and left word of my support for the public works authorization bill, S. 497, which was recorded on Thursday afternoon, at which time I was paired for the bill with the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Making the best plane connections possible, I was not able to return to the Senate until late Friday afternoon, at which time I learned S. 1034 had been made the pending business of the Senate, had been brought up for Senate action, but was objected to by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on the basis that it did not comply with the Morse formula.

The bill in question, S. 1034, was introduced by the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], on February 4, 1957, at the request of the Department of Agriculture. It would authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the University of Missouri, for agricultural purposes, the Midwest Claypan Experiment Station located at McCredie in Callaway County, Mo.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1034), to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the University of Missouri, for agricultural purposes, certain real property in Callaway County, Mo., was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the University of Missouri, without cost, the real property, together with the buildings and improvements thereon, constituting the United States Department of Agriculture Midwest Claypan Experiment Station located at McCredie in the county of Callaway, State of Missouri, which property is more particularly described as follows:

The east half of the southwest quarter of section 10, and 140 acres, more or less, being all that part of the southeast quarter of section 10, lying west of the center of the Fulton and Mexico road;

Also 14.90 acres being that part of the east half of the northeast quarter of section 10 lying south of the McCredie and Williamsburg road;

Also 1 acre, more or less, in the northwest corner of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 11, being all that part of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter lying west of the Fulton and Mexico road;

Also about 1 acre in the southwest corner of the northwest quarter of section 11, being that part of said quarter section lying south of the McCredie and Williamsburg road and west of the Fulton and Mexico road;

Also all that part containing about 65 acres of the west half of the northeast quarter and of the east half of the northwest quarter of section 10, lying south of the McCredie and Williamsburg road;

All of the above-described property lying and being in township 48 north, of range 9 west, in the aforesaid State and county, and containing 300 acres, more or less. Such property shall be conveyed upon the condition that it shall be used by the curators

of the University of Missouri for the purposes of the college of agriculture. In the event that the curators of the University of Missouri shall cease to use such property for such purposes, all right, title, and interest in and to the said property shall automatically revert to the United States.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Soon after the introduction of the bill, on February 8, 1957, I wrote to Dr. Elmer Ellis, president of the University of Missouri, asking for his comments on the bill, and he replied on February 21, 1957.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these letters be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 8, 1957.

Dr. ELMER ELLIS,
President, University of Missouri,
Columbia, Mo.

DEAR ELMER: Attached is a copy of S. 1034, which, in accordance with the attached letter from the Department of Agriculture, was recently introduced by Senator ELLENDER.

Inasmuch as this bill has been referred to the Senate Agriculture Committee, of which I am a member, I will appreciate your comments.

Kind regards.

Sincerely,

STUART SYMINGTON.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI,
Columbia, Mo., February 21, 1957.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR STUART: I appreciate your sending me a copy of Senate bill 1034 with the enclosure from the Department of Agriculture. Frankly this is the first I had heard of this proposal but the people in Agriculture have been close to it for a long time. It seems that the equipment on the farm was turned over to the college of agriculture by the Department of Agriculture some time ago before I became president; therefore, I was not informed about it. Dean Longwell informs me that these farms are being turned over to experiment stations and colleges of agriculture in other States but he did not know of any reasons why there was a delay after the actual operation of the farm had been assigned to us.

It is desirable I think that the bill pass and we get title to the land as it provides opportunities for experimentations that we should be carrying on.

Certainly I appreciate your continued interest in the university and your keeping me informed about these matters.

Cordially,

ELMER ELLIS.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The bill was considered by the Senate Agriculture Committee and was reported to the Senate on March 26, 1957. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the committee's report (No. 186), be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill provides for transfer of the Midwest Claypan Experiment Station to the curators of the University of Missouri, without cost, conditioned upon use for the purposes of the College of Agriculture. The station is now being operated and maintained by the university under an agreement which relieved the Department of Agriculture of considerable costs.

DEPARTMENTAL VIEWS

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1957.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of proposed legislation to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the University of Missouri, for agricultural purposes, certain real property in Callaway County, Mo.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the curators of the University of Missouri, without cost, the United States Department of Agriculture Midwest Claypan Experiment Station, at McCredie, Mo. In addition to the land, the conveyance would include buildings and improvements at the station. The transfer would be made on the condition that the property be used for the purposes of the College of Agriculture. In the event that the property ceased to be used for such purposes, all right, title, and interest in the said property would automatically revert to the Federal Government.

The land on which the Midwest Claypan Experiment Station is located was acquired by the Soil Conservation Service of this Department in 1937 by purchase from the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co. The purchase price was \$13,107.48. The property acquired at purchase consisted of 300 acres of land, including buildings estimated to be valued at \$3,975. This station was transferred from the Soil Conservation Service to the Agricultural Research Service under Secretary's Memorandum No. 1318, dated October 14, 1952.

Under the provisions of a memorandum of understanding entered into on September 20, 1954, by this Department and the curators of the University of Missouri, a cooperative research program in soil and water conservation and management studies, including work on terrace layout and design, erosion control, irrigation and water-supply development, and effects of deep placement of fertilizers on the utilization of claypan soils, is being carried on. This agreement also transferred the title and possession of the personal property and operating equipment to be used and disposed of in carrying out the terms of the agreement. Under the agreement the university assumed the responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the station.

The aforementioned memorandum was to serve as a document of cooperation pending consideration that the facilities would be transferred to the university through normal legislative channels.

When the University of Missouri assumed responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the station, the Department was relieved of considerable costs. The Missouri Agricultural Experiment Station has materially increased its financial support for the operation of the station. The increased contribution by the State makes it possible for the Department to cooperate in other research programs of high priority.

This proposed legislation follows closely the pattern established by Public Law 825, 81st Congress, approved September 23, 1950, which provided for transfer of title, without cost, of certain agricultural dryland and irrigation field stations to the States in which such stations were located. It authorized the Secretary of Agriculture or, when the lands concerned were public domain, the Secretary of the Interior, to convey the interest of the United States in the lands including water rights, buildings, and improvements at certain specified field stations of the Department of Agriculture to the States concerned. Transfers were not mandatory but were subject to arrangements mutually agreeable to the States and the Department.

Conveyance of this property would result in no additional cost to the Government.

We have discussed this proposal with Missouri State authorities and it is satisfactory to them.

A copy of the proposed legislation and a similar letter have also been sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Included in this report is a letter from Mr. True D. Morse, Acting Secretary of Agriculture, dated January 24, 1957, and addressed to the President of the United States Senate.

I invite particular attention to the following statement in that letter:

Under the provisions of a memorandum of understanding entered into on September 20, 1954, by this Department and the curators of the University of Missouri, a cooperative research program in soil and water conservation and management studies, including work on terrace layout and design, erosion control, irrigation and water-supply development, and effects of deep placement of fertilizers on the utilization of claypan soils, is being carried on. This agreement also transferred the title and possession of the personal property and operating equipment to be used and disposed of in carrying out the terms of the agreement. Under the agreement the university assumed the responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the station.

The aforementioned memorandum was to serve as a document of cooperation pending consideration that the facilities would be transferred to the university through normal legislative channels.

When the University of Missouri assumed responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the station, the Department was relieved of considerable costs. The Missouri Agricultural Experiment Station has materially increased its financial support for the operation of the station. The increased contribution by the State makes it possible for the Department to cooperate in other research programs of high priority.

Mr. President, after reading the comments of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on Saturday morning, following my return, we immediately contacted Dean John H. Longwell of the College of Agriculture, University of Missouri, and asked that he furnish us with a statement of the expenditures by the University of Missouri in carrying on the cooperative experimental work in the Midwest Claypan Experiment Station, which the Department of Agriculture now desires authority to transfer to the University of Missouri.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from Dean Longwell, dated March 30, 1957, together with a statement showing that the University of Missouri has expended a total of \$116,291.16 on this cooperative experimental work.

There being no objection, the letter and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI,
Columbia, Mo., March 30, 1957.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: Enclosed is a statement of the expenditures by the Mis-

souri Agricultural Experiment Station in support of research conducted on the Midwest Claypan Experiment Farm, McCredie, Mo., and a few notes concerning the work at this farm. The Missouri station has furnished office space and laboratory facilities for Federal employees without charge.

Beginning July 1954, the Missouri station has operated the farm and furnished facilities for Federal employees who are cooperating in the work.

Very truly yours,

J. H. LONGWELL, Director.

Expenditures, McCredie-university funds

Year:	Amount
1940-44-----	\$12,730.13
1945-----	2,700.00
1946-----	1,794.92
1947-----	3,878.35
1948-----	3,180.12
1949-----	6,376.71
1950-----	4,853.24
1951-----	7,261.49
1952-----	7,870.03
1953-----	6,311.17
1954-----	13,000.00
1955-----	14,770.00
1956-----	15,440.00
1957-----	16,125.00

Total----- \$116,291.16

EXPENDITURES—M'CREDIE FARM

Soil Conservation Service started experiments about 1940. Operations moved from Bethany to McCredie in 1944.

University of Missouri has furnished office space and laboratory facilities for Federal employees since 1940.

All sales funds were placed in a special university account and used in farm operations at McCredie.

May 13, 1949, University of Missouri board of curators designated McCredie Farm as an outlying experiment field.

In 1954, University of Missouri assumed responsibility of operating farm and increased appropriations for research work. Since that time the University of Missouri has assumed responsibility for providing facilities for Federal employees to work.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in raising objection to the passage of this bill, S. 1034, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] questioned the statement of the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, True D. Morse:

This proposed legislation follows closely the pattern established by Public Law 825, 81st Congress, approved September 23, 1950, which provided for transfer of title, without cost, of certain agricultural dryland and irrigation field stations to the States in which such stations were located. It authorized the Secretary of Agriculture or, when the lands concerned were public domain, the Secretary of the Interior to convey the interest of the United States in the lands including water rights, buildings, and improvements at certain specified field stations of the Department of Agriculture to the States concerned. Transfers were not mandatory but were subject to arrangements mutually agreeable to the States and the Department.

Mr. President, I was not a member of the Senate at the time Public Law 825 was passed by the 81st Congress, and approved September 23, 1950. I have, however, read this public law and find the following conditions included therein:

"SEC. 2. Conveyances or patents hereunder shall be upon such conditions as in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture will assure the use of such station in the cooperative agricultural experimental work of the Department of Agriculture and the respective

State. Any such conveyances of the land shall contain a reservation to the United States of all the minerals in the land together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

Mr. President, by telephone we have read this section from Public Law 825, 81st Congress, to Dean Longwell, of the Missouri College of Agriculture.

Dean Longwell assures us that it is his understanding that the transfer of title is being made subject to this condition.

Mr. President, Department of Agriculture officials have also been in contact with Dean Longwell since last Friday. I ask unanimous consent that a statement from the Department be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
STATEMENT CONCERNING S. 1034, A BILL TO
AUTHORIZE AND DIRECT THE SECRETARY OF
AGRICULTURE TO CONVEY TO THE UNIVERSITY
OF MISSOURI, FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES,
CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY IN CALLAWAY COUNTY,
MO.

On September 20, 1954, the Department entered into a memorandum of understanding with the curators of the University of Missouri covering a cooperative research program in soil and water conservation and management in Missouri and the maintenance and operation of a cooperative field station at McCredie, Mo. Under the terms of this agreement it was agreed that both parties would participate in this project and that the university would maintain the buildings, roads, ditches, fences, and other permanent and operating equipment belonging to the research branch and used under the terms of this agreement. The buildings and facilities at the McCredie Station are within the terms of this provision and have been maintained by the State in accordance with the agreement. It is intended that the cooperation will continue and assurance has been received that the university will continue to maintain these facilities.

The Department's report on S. 1034 anticipated that the existing memorandum of understanding between the curators of the University of Missouri and the Department would continue to remain in effect even after the station would be transferred. This latter point was verified in our discussion with the personnel of the university. They have assured us that it was their intent that a cooperative program on soil and water research will continue in the future. The language in S. 1034 provides that such property shall be conveyed upon the condition that it shall be used by the curators of the University of Missouri for the purposes of the college of agriculture. This language is somewhat broader than the language provided in Public Law 825, 81st Congress, under section 2. Since it is intended both by the Department and by the University of Missouri that our present cooperative program continue to exist even after the proposed transfer, neither the Department nor the university would have any objection to the inclusion in the pending S. 1034 of language similar to section 2 of Public Law 825, 81st Congress, which reads as follows:

"Conveyance or patents hereunder shall be upon such conditions as in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture will assure the use of such station in the cooperative agricultural experimental work of the Department of Agriculture and the respective State. Any such conveyances of the land shall contain a reservation to the United States of all the minerals in the land to-

gether with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe."

In view of the substantial cooperative contributions made by the University of Missouri since 1954, and particularly its maintenance of McCredie Station, it is felt that the conveyance should be without charge as proposed in S. 1034.

Copy of the memorandum of understanding between the Department and the curators of the University of Missouri is attached.

Mr. SYMINGTON. To prevent any possible misunderstanding, I have at the desk an amendment to S. 1034, providing the same conditions as in Public Law 825, 81st Congress. I ask that the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. SYMINGTON was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Beginning on page 2, line 22, with the word "Such", strike out all through page 3, line 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Such property shall be conveyed upon such conditions as in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture will assure the use of such property in the cooperative agricultural experimental work of the Department of Agriculture and the State of Missouri. The conveyance of such property shall contain a reservation to the United States of all the minerals in the land together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe."

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Dean Longwell reports the land to be transferred to the University of Missouri, under S. 1034, has an estimated present value of \$60,000. However, I wish to assure the Senator from Oregon that this is not a transfer of land owned by the United States without the giving of consideration by the transferee.

In fact, the United States will receive substantial benefits by this transfer, which will soon surpass the value of the property to be conveyed.

The Department of Agriculture reports that under the memorandum of understanding entered into in preparation for this transfer of title, the University of Missouri assumed operations and maintenance expenses of the station and facilities. This action by the university made possible the release of Agricultural Research Service personnel for additional high priority cooperative research work, both at this experiment station and elsewhere; as one example, irrigation studies at Elsberry, Mo., in cooperation with the State of Missouri, and the Soil Conservation Service.

The Department further reports that were it not for this transfer of responsibility, an additional expenditure of \$20,000 a year would be required to attain this same result.

It is for this reason, that the Department of Agriculture recommends on S. 1034, as it did on Public Law 825, of the 81st Congress, that the transfer of title to this Agricultural Experiment Station be made, without cost to the transferee, the University of Missouri.

Mr. President, with this additional information, and with this understanding as a part of the legislative history of this bill, I trust that the senior Senator of

Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will withdraw his objection and that the Senate will pass S. 1034, with the amendment I have proposed.

CONGRESSIONAL RESERVE TRAINING UNIT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, those of us who are Members of the Congress and who also hold active United States Army Reserve or National Guard commissions have long felt a need for some means of maintaining our Reserve status in good standing.

Recognizing this need, the Department of the Army has now organized a Reserve training unit which will be titled "The United States Army Congressional Command and Operations Group, USAR."

This unit will conduct training assemblies once weekly while the Congress is in session. Assemblies normally will be conducted on Tuesday morning at 0830 hours. The initial meeting, which will be an organizational meeting, will be held this Wednesday morning at 0830 in the House caucus room.

Col. ROBERT L. F. SIKES, USAR, Representative from Florida, has agreed to act as liaison with the Army for this program. He has been assured by the Army that these training assemblies will be stimulating, informative, educational, and up to date. The program affords an excellent opportunity to a Reserve officer to keep up his Reserve status and interests with minimum interference with Congressional duties.

Participation in this unit will be on a nonpay basis. Members of the Congress who hold commissions in the Ready, Standby, or Retired Reserve of the Army, or who are commissioned in the National Guard, are eligible for membership in the unit. Staff members of Congressional committees and staff members of individual Congressmen who are commissioned in the Reserve components are invited to participate. Membership in this unit will not sever affiliation of the Member with his home unit. The Department of the Army will insure that individual records of Members will continue to be kept in their present home Reserve unit, and credit for participation in the Congressional training unit will be entered in the records of their home unit.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 15, 1957, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) to implement further the act of July 15, 1946, by approving the signature by the Secretary of the Treasury of an agreement amending the Anglo-American Financial Agreement of December 6, 1945.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate

adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 16, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 15 (legislative day of April 12), 1957:

IN THE NAVY

I nominate the following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

William A. Abbott	James A. Buckner
Robert H. Alles	Harold O. Bullock, Jr.
William T. Alexander	Chester W. Burchett
Thomas L. Allman, Jr.	Thomas J. Burke
Theodore A. Almstedt, Jr.	David P. Burleigh
Harvey K. Altergott	James M. Burns
Franklin F. Alvarez	John D. Burns
Anders T. Anderson	David L. Butterfield
Edward E. Anderson	James J. Caciola
George W. Anderson	Thomas S. Cameron, Jr.
Charles H. Andrews	William Campbell, Jr.
Thomas W. Andrews	Charles S. Carroll
Gary P. Antonides	Richard M. Chanslor
Philip Arcuni	Richard N. Charles
George W. Ashford, Jr.	Ejner S. Christensen, Jr.
Harvey B. Atkinson	John E. Christensen
Robert F. Atwell III	Robert W. S. Christenson
Dwight E. Avis, Jr.	Loren L. Clark
Samuel C. Bailey, Jr.	Redmond L. Clevenger
James C. Baker	Frederick B. Cobi
Peter A. Baker	Lawrence Cohen
Ronald E. Baker	William M. Cole II
Joseph F. Ballou	James J. Coleman
James E. Bangert	William N. Collier, Jr.
Milton H. Bank II	David M. Collins
Harold D. Barker	Eugene D. Conner
Nathaniel C. Barker	Henry B. Converse
Frank W. Barnes	John H. Cook III
Craig L. Barnum	Thomas L. P. Cook
John E. Bartocci	Daniel L. Cooper
Bryan W. Barton	David S. Cooper
Stanley E. Bator, Jr.	John H. Copeland
Herbert Bauer	Samuel W. Coulbourn
Charles J. Beasley	James P. Cox
Don G. Beatty	William B. Cox
James R. Beatty III	Donald R. Crandall
Robert R. Beeler	Ian R. Crichton
Paul O. Behrends	William M. Crowe, Jr.
James E. Bender	Alton I. Crowell, Jr.
William B. Benjes	William N. Currie
Bruce A. Bennington	William H. Curry, Jr.
James W. Bibb	Frederick O. Dammann
Charles E. Biele, Jr.	Robert L. Daughenbaugh
Richard O. Black	Charles L. Davis
Ronald K. Blackner	John W. Davis, Jr.
George R. Blessing	Philip C. Davis
Harold A. Boggs, Jr.	Ray E. Davis, Jr.
Charles S. Bond	John A. DeCarlo
James H. Bostick	Robert F. Deegan
Bruce B. Bower	Robert E. DeLashmitt
Robert L. Bowers	David A. Delo
Joseph J. Boyajian	Bruce DeMars
Heyward E. Boyce III	Jefferson R. Dennis, Jr.
Peter B. Boyne	James P. Dickey
Frederick L. Bradley, Jr.	Jacob P. Didler, Jr.
Robert Brazzon	Charles J. Diehlmann
Leroy E. Brenner	John S. Disher
Allan G. Brookes, Jr.	Ned E. Dixon
Dennis M. Brooks	Richard H. Dolliver
Bobby S. Broome	Thomas F. Donnelly
Donald G. Brown	Robert A. Doragh
Kenneth C. Brown	Ray W. Dove, Jr.
Parke L. Brown, Jr.	Thomas F. Drumm, Jr.
Randall R. Brown	Ferdinand C. Dugan III
William T. Brown	Andrew F. Dulik
Thomas M. Browne	William C. Dunham
George W. Bryant	
Wilbur P. Buck	

Stanton P. Dunlap	Leo G. Hyatt
Robert J. Duppenenthaler	David A. Isquith
James E. Durr	Thomas P. James, Jr.
Thomas E. Dyer	Vencin L. Jamison
Thomas A. Eades	David W. Jaynes
Leon A. Edney	George W. Jensen
Clifford H. Eley III	Glen L. Jermstad
Warren R. Ellsworth, Jr.	John D. Jerome
Terry E. Emery	Leonard W. Johnson II
Richard F. Emmett	Peter A. Junghans
Richard E. Enkebohl	Steven E. Kadas
Theodore W. Erikson	Norman H. Kall
David L. Fahrney	Richard N. Kane
William G. Fallai	Bennett D. Katz
Grover F. Fannin	William A. Kauffman
Raymond J. Fazzio	Timothy E. Keating
Bruce C. Felt	John J. Kelley
Francis J. Fendler, Jr.	Daniel J. Kenney
Lloyd W. Fernald, Jr.	Roy A. Kensinger
David B. Fickenscher	William A. Kerr, Jr.
David E. Fields	Robert L. Kershner
John L. Finley	Martin D. Kiefer
William A. Finn	Richard H. Kiel
Lloyd D. Follmer, Jr.	Carleton J. King, Jr.
Frank R. Ford, Jr.	James W. King
James H. Foresman III	Thomas J. Kirkland III
Robert N. Foss	James D. Kirkpatrick
Donald W. Fowlkes	Montelle N. Knapp
Robert F. Fox	Frederick C. Knauf
Thomas R. Fox	Richard H. Knauf, Jr.
Bruce Friedrich	William C. Knodle
Wayne R. Fritz	Jerry G. Knutson
James R. Gant	Joseph W. Koch, Jr.
Dudley A. Gaouette	Alfred M. Koster IV
Walter J. Gautier	Leonard T. Kozlov
Joseph J. Gawarkiewicz III	Theodore R. Kramer, Jr.
Richard C. Gentz	Thomas J. Krilowicz
Michele D. Giambattista	William W. Kronzer
Douglas B. Gibson	Urban R. Lamay, Jr.
Ronald B. Gibson	George E. Lampert, Jr.
Sherwood E. Gifford, Jr.	William G. Lange
Harry M. S. Gimber III	George M. Lanman
Lawrence B. Goldstein	Kent W. Larabee
Ronald G. Goldstone	Rene R. LaSalle
James P. Googe, Jr.	Richard N. Leahy
Paul E. Graff	Mark M. Lenhart
Kermit W. Greeneisen	Rex L. Leonard
Duane F. Greenhoe	William N. Leslie
Robert T. Grigsby	Edmund F. Lewis
Michael J. Gubitosi	Philip R. Licari
Charles R. Hall III	Donald J. Lisa
John E. Hamilton	Gill F. Livingston
Ira R. Hanna	Fred W. Llewellyn III
Richard D. Hartman	Robert G. Loewenthal
Robert K. Hastie	Cleve E. Loman, Jr.
Duran T. Hatfield	Andrew P. Longton
Paul L. Hathaway, Jr.	Gary B. Lowe
Robert R. Haven, Jr.	Douglas L. Lowrance
Cecil E. Haviland	Wendell H. Lueker
Allan H. Hawk	Charles T. Luke, Jr.
Alvin G. Haworth, Jr.	Robert A. Luke
Jesse H. Heald, Jr.	Clayton W. Lynch
Robert I. Heisner, Jr.	Richard L. Madouse
John S. Hellewell	Lawrence R. Magner
Allen P. Hemphill, Jr.	Thomas J. Maguire
Patrick Henry, Jr.	Edward J. Mahon, Jr.
John W. Herlihy	Charles A. Mahoney, Jr.
George G. Herring III	Terrence M. Mahony
Wesley C. Hewitt	Kenneth C. Malley
John S. Heyde, Jr.	Philip N. Mandel
Shannon D. Heyward	John W. Margedant
Orrie G. Hiett, Jr.	Thomas A. Marnane
Theodore K. Higgins	Ronald F. Marryott
William H. Higgins	Norman P. Marshall, Jr.
Dean H. Hines	John S. Martin, Jr.
Richard J. Hlava	Hugo E. Marxer
William J. Hobler, Jr.	Andrew S. Massimino
Lawrence M. Hogan	Lawrence E. Masten
John A. Holt III	William B. Matney, Jr.
Herbert L. Hoppe	Ebe C. McCabe, Jr.
John E. Horsefield	Hugh W. McCauley
Frederic N. Howe, Jr.	Gilson K. McClure, Jr.
Jonathan T. Howe	Richard A. McConnell, Jr.
James J. Hower	Richard L. McCracken
John H. Howland	Lawrence E. McCullough
Ira A. Hughey	Thomas J. McGinty

Daniel E. McGlasson	Edwin A. Putkonen
Charles R. McGrall, Jr.	James H. Quinn
David B. McGuigan	Ronald E. Rau
John T. McHugh	Robert B. Reed, Jr.
William M. McHugh	Harold L. Reichart, Jr.
William C. McIlvain, Jr.	James R. Reid III
Junious A. McKee, Jr.	Henry F. Rempt, Jr.
Michael F. McKenna	Richard B. Renner
Albert S. McManes	John D. Richardson, Jr.
Kenmore R. McManes	Sherwood L. Ritchie
John A. McMorris II	Kenneth F. Robinson
Carter V. McNeese	Robert G. Robinson
James L. McNerney	Denis P. Roche
Roger B. McPherson	Walter V. Roeser, Jr.
William N. Mears	Carl J. Rohsenberger, Jr.
Richard P. Meaux	William K. Romoser, Jr.
Wallace B. Mechling	Wilson C. Rook
Norbert W. Melnick	Robert H. Rositzke
Kenneth N. Meneke	Thomas E. Ross
Walter T. Meukow	David J. Rosser
David A. Meyer	Roger H. Rotondi
Daniel A. Mickey	Daniel L. Roudebush
John E. Middleton	Fay O. Round, Jr.
William M. Mickle	Oren G. Rutemiller, Jr.
Thomas J. Miklos	Paul T. Saari
Donald L. Miller	Leyon D. Sakey
Peter R. Miller	Robert L. Saracco
Howard E. Minitier, Jr.	Tommy D. Sawyer
Stephen Missallidis	Richard H. Scales
Donald L. Mitchell	David G. Schaffer
David L. Mitchell	Jack W. Scheible
Christopher N. K. Mooers	Gilbert P. Schneide-wind
Harold L. Mooney, Jr.	Henry J. Schneider
Harry R. Moore, Jr.	Douglas L. Scott
Jimmie R. Moore	Roy E. Seaman
Conrad R. Morency	Richard A. Secor
Richard P. Murdoch	Gerald Sedor
George S. Murphy	Alfred E. Senior, Jr.
James H. Murphy	Laverne S. Severance, Jr.
Michael A. Murphy	James E. Shay
John P. Myers	John B. Shewmaker
Joseph F. Neary	Ronald M. Shields
John H. Nelson	Charles P. Silvia
Robert F. Nevin	Bennet S. Simonton
John W. Newell	James R. Simsarian
Burton K. Nichols	John D. Sipes
Niel P. Nielsen	Dennis Y. Sloan
Bruce F. Nolan	Stephen B. Sloane
Charles F. Noll	Bertram D. Smith, Jr.
Eugene J. Normand	Howard E. Smith, Jr.
David M. North	Jess J. Smith, Jr.
George E. O'Brien	William E. Smith, Jr.
Daniel J. O'Connell	William J. Smith
James J. O'Connell	William S. Smith, Jr.
James P. O'Hara, Jr.	Selig Solomon
Brian E. O'Neill	Arthur T. Spring
James P. O'Neill, Jr.	John L. Stacey
LeRoy C. Ostrander	George L. Stallman III
Gene A. Paasch	Robert A. Steelneck
Henry H. Page, Jr.	Frederick N. Steiner
William N. Palmer II	Edward L. Stewart, Jr.
Kenneth H. Parcell	David J. Stiller
Frank W. Parker	Richard C. Stober
Ural C. Parnell	Raymond N. Stoetzer
James G. Partlow	Francis H. Stoodley
John S. Paul	Kenneth A. Strahm
Jimmie "D" Paulk, Jr.	Robert O. Strange, Jr.
John D. Peace III	Stanley P. Strickland
Robert W. Peacher	Moore A. Stuart
William H. Peerenboom	Wesley A. Sweat, Jr.
Gary R. Pelphrey	Oscar C. Tack, Jr.
Edmund J. Peresluha II	Bruce R. Tapper
Kenneth D. Peterson	Bruce A. Thomas
Paul A. Peterson	David M. Thomas
George Philipps	Roy D. Thompson, Jr.
James J. Pistotnik	Robert E. Tims
James F. Pitney	Arthur B. Trammell
James R. Poole	Charles W. Truxall, Jr.
Richard G. Porter	John J. Turner, Jr.
Douglas F. Pritchard	Lawrence W. Twitchell
Norman E. Prosser	John L. Ulrich
Ronald L. Pruett	Samuel G. Underhill
Victor H. Prushan	Clyde H. VanLanding-ham, Jr.
Bruce H. Purvis	
Samuel M. Purvis	

James Varnadore
Edward B. Vaughan, Jr.
Walter V. R. Vieweg, Jr.
Thomas H. Vollmer
Richard T. Vosseller
Clarence L. Walker, Jr.
Thaddeus O. Walker, Jr.
Burke Ward
Norman D. Waring
Robert L. Warters
Alexander E. Wattay
William K. Weaver
Robert F. Welland
Frederick C. Weiss, Jr.
Robert M. Wellborn, Jr.
Herbert J. West, Jr.
William W. West

Jack L. Weston
Thomas P. Whaley
Walter Whipple
George W. White, Jr.
John R. White
Wilson R. Whitmire
Charles H. Wilbur
Albert P. Williams, Jr.
Garry L. Wilson
Ronald J. Wiltsie
Warren A. Woodrow
Francis G. Woods
Joseph C. Woolman
Dwight I. Worrell
Arthur St. Clair Wright
John M. Yarbrough
Harry M. Yockey
Emory P. Zimmer
Allen M. Zollars, Jr.

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Richard G. Adams
William D. Aldenderfer
David L. Anglim
Charles E. Bachelder, Jr.
David W. Balding
James C. Ballantine, Jr.
Warner P. Basse
George D. Cassimus
Paul D. Coon
James E. Craig, Jr.
Hans R. Croeber
Robert L. Crouch
Ronald M. DelDuca
Allison B. Donaldson
Joseph J. Duffy, Jr.
Richard D. Furiga
Bernard L. Gleason
Ronald T. Hall
Charles E. Harlow
Phillip C. Holmen
Donald R. Jahn
Rodwell C. Johnson
George N. Kachigian
Robert H. Kase
Arthur W. Kelly

Karl W. Koch
Robert T. Lutz, Jr.
Stuart W. Marcotte
Gary D. Matthews
Richard H. Nace
Frank M. Nichols, Jr.
John E. Nolan
Gary B. Nuss
Richard B. Nygaard
Jerry G. Patterson
Robert A. Phillips
Charles T. Popik
Constantinus P. Pralhals
Robert W. Pruess
Joseph V. Reilly, Jr.
Eugene C. Rook, Jr.
John D. Roselott
Robert W. St. Martin
Conrad P. Schulte
Frederick G. Shea
John E. Sheehan, Jr.
Thomas M. Sims, Jr.
James J. Spillane
Thomas R. Weissinger
James R. Wilber

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James E. Bligh
Jerome J. Barczak
John L. Clearwater
Frederick M. Derr
Jerome R. Dunn

John C. Fraser, Jr.
Lester E. McMenamin, Jr.
Harold R. Somerset

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Donald E. Abram
Charles P. Adams
William E. Aherne
Roger E. Alberty
Louis P. Aldana
Robert F. Aldrich
Bruce G. Alexander
William C. Allen, Jr.
David W. Almgren
Thomas P. Anderle
Gordon W. Andersen
Benny A. Anderson
Donald C. Anderson
Norman D. Anderson
Richard C. Anderson
Robert E. Anewalt
Stanley R. Arthur
Donald S. Atkinson
Bernard S. Awtrey, Jr.
William H. Baddley
Frank B. Bailey
Joseph J. Baldes
Roger L. Baldwin

John E. Ball
Walter E. Barbee
Michael J. Barron
Richard J. Barry III
Terry M. Badger
Charles A. Baechler
Lawrence C. Baker, Jr.
James E. Barger
Richard H. Barker
John W. Barrows
Donald W. Bartlett
Larry D. Bartlett
James M. Barnes
Robert L. Barry
Paul H. Bassin
Kenneth W. Bateman
Richard H. Bates
William H. Beatty III
Donald E. Beck
John R. Beck
Lance S. Belville
Charles A. Berghane, Jr.

David J. Berrier
William H. Berry
Edward C. Bessey
Thomas C. Betterton
Francis M. Betts III
Harold R. Beury
John A. Bevan, Jr.
Charles H. Binkley
Frederick W. Bishop
Harold F. Bishop
Lawrence R. Bishop
Herbert L. Black, Jr.
Michael G. Blankenship
Jack Bluestein
Howard Z. Bogert, Jr.
Frank B. Boice
Thomas A. Boisseau
James R. Boling
Stuart W. Bolinger
Ray S. Bolze
Thomas J. Boodell, Jr.
Paul A. Bornstein
Robert L. Boswell
William C. Bowden
Addison M. Bowman III
Gerald L. Bowman
William D. Brandon
James J. Brennan
Edward A. Brewton
Frank G. Briggs
Richard A. Brobst
David M. Brode
Ronald A. Brookbank
Donald C. Brown
John S. Brown
Thomas S. Brown
Walter C. Brown
William J. Brownlow
David D. Brunell
William B. Buchanan
David E. Buck
John S. Bull
Philip E. Burcher
John E. Burgess
John W. Burnett, Jr.
Stanley R. Burnett
James B. Burrows
Robert A. Burton, Jr.
Marvin L. Busch
Robert H. Bussard
John P. Butler
John M. Byers
W. H. Gerald Caldwell, Jr.
Kim J. Calvin
John R. Campbell
Robert B. Campbell
John J. Campillo
Robert G. Carleton
Raymond F. Carlin, Jr.
Robert M. Caron
Jann W. Carpenter
William G. Carson
Sanford P. Carter
Robert G. Case
Walter E. Cates
James W. Cave
Glenn R. Cella
Roger B. Chaffee
John T. Chambers
Jong M. Chew
James D. Church
James J. Cierznjak
Douglas L. Clarke
Robert G. Clason
Ralph B. Clifton
Roger L. Clifton
Andrew M. Coats
Frank F. Colburn
George F. Cole III
William W. Cole, Jr.
Edward J. Collard
James B. Conner
David M. Connor, Jr.
Michael A. Conron
David W. Cook
Edward H. Cook
Patrick D. Coogan
Jesse D. Coolbaugh

John D. Cooper, Jr.
Robert E. Copeland
Gordon W. Corwin
Richard E. Cossitt
Kenneth H. Cowles
Darrell Z. Cox
Edward L. Cox
Joseph F. Cox
Robert G. Cox
Samuel R. Crain III
Forrest S. Crawford
Charles C. Cromer
Claude C. Cross
Ronald L. Crozier
Jack D. Crutchfield
Joseph R. Culhane, Jr.
Kenneth E. Cumblidge
Robert G. Cunningham, Jr.
Shane A. Cunningham
Shaun Cunningham
William E. Cupps
David S. Currie
Leonard P. Dague
James C. Dale III
Alexander S. Daley
Lewis M. Dalgarn
Dale S. Dallan
Frederick T. Daly III
Herbert V. Danielson, Jr.
William M. Dante
Thomas E. Darby, Jr.
Charles T. Darragh, Jr.
Charles A. Davenport
Theodore M. Davenport
Craig H. Davis
Jackson K. Davis, Jr.
Robert A. Davis
Robert E. Davis
Edward C. Davidson
John M. Davidson
William P. Dawkins
Laurence R. DeBuys III
Carl F. Deibaugh, Jr.
Francis B. Degress III
Robert E. DeKinder, Jr.
Joseph G. Demarest III
Michael B. Demetrios
Charles D. DeSimio
John B. DeVries
Douglas A. Dial
Donald D. Dixon
Charles M. Doherty
Herman A. Doll
Frank C. Dorsey
John P. Dotson
John L. Dougan, Jr.
Charles W. Doughdrill
Robert L. Dow
Robert J. Dowling
John K. Doyle, Jr.
Richard J. Duane
Daniel L. Dudas
Douglas W. Duderstadt
Richard L. Duncan
William E. Durham
Denis D. Durnan
Barry J. Dyer
Henry C. Dyer II
Robert K. Eagan
Robert W. Edson
Daniel J. Edwards
Gary M. Edwards
Fred G. Eldson
Richard W. Ekblad
Robert L. Elich
Robert "A" Elkin
Richard W. Elliott
Jerry K. Emrich
Burton D. Engle
Raymond V. Engler
Samuel L. Erwin
Richard G. Erwine
John R. Essig
Robert C. Enstam

Daniel B. Evans
Gary R. Evans
Isaac T. Evans
John J. Fahey, Jr.
Edward B. Farley, Jr.
David W. Fay
Herbert Feinroth
Paul L. Feldman
Robert L. Ferguson
John R. Ferrari
Richard A. Fidler
William T. Finley, Jr.
David H. Fischer
Thomas F. Fishburn
John W. Fisher
George P. Fitzgibbons
Joel L. Fletcher III
Irvine D. Flinn
Ernest D. Foote
Robert R. Foote
Ronald J. Foster
Ronald L. Fowler
Otis O. Fox
Robert J. Fredericks
George M. Fredrickson
Gilbert M. Freedman
Albert M. Freeman III
Paul S. Frommer
Charles J. Fuqua
Robert S. Gale
William R. Gallant
Donald R. Gardner
Frederick Gardner
Norinan R. Gerness
Joseph Gerstner, Jr.
Richard L. Geyer
Vernon W. Gibson, Jr.
James H. Gilbert, Jr.
Richard E. Gilbert
Lawrence A. Gilliland, Jr.
Stanley F. Gillmar
Edward P. Gistaro
Joseph R. Godwin
Joseph P. N. Goodell
Samuel Gordon
Walter J. Gordon
Grady L. Gothard
George K. Gowans
Donald V. Graf
Richard P. Graff
Edward J. Grant
Garland A. Gray, Jr.
Richard F. Green
David S. Greiling
David H. Griffin
James J. Griffin
John I. Griffin
Roger F. Griffin
Richard A. Groeneveld
Dean A. Grossman
Victor S. Gulliver
Donald H. Gunderson
Larry S. Gutsch
Vincent T. Hackett
Gerald L. Hackler
William K. Haackler
Paul A. Hagedorn
Robert G. Hahn
Paul V. Halberg
Charles M. Hale
David S. Hall
Gordon B. Hall, Jr.
John P. Hall, Jr.
Richard O. Hall
Charles D. Hamilton
William E. Hammond
Souren Hanessian, Jr.
Bryant M. Hanley, Jr.
Ronald F. Hanna
Theodore B. Hannah
David W. Hansen
John A. Hansen
Lee E. Hargrave, Jr.
John V. Harker
Daniel H. Harkness, Jr.
Charles F. Harner, Jr.
John O. Harper
Eugene S. Harris
John L. Harrison, Jr.
John Haruch

Jerry M. Hatcher
Harry S. Havens
Ash M. Hawk
Richard S. Hayes
Charles L. Hays, Jr.
Larry Hebert
Walter Heigeland
Arthur A. Hellebusch
John A. Helms
David C. Henderson
George R. Henderson
Gordon W. Henderson
Tom A. Hendrickson
John B. Henneman, Jr.
Armand M. Hess
Gene A. Heth
Robert J. Hiebner, Jr.
Lyle J. Higgins
James R. Higgs
John H. Highfill III
Daniel C. Hildenbrand
Victor R. Hill
Robert M. Hillyer
Bruce W. Hilyard
Arthur R. Hirst
Peter W. Hobbs
George A. Hodges
Franklin R. Hoeven
Larry L. Holdren
Jan P. Holick
George H. Honeycutt
James B. Hope
John R. Hooper, Jr.
Shirley W. Holt
Alan E. Hoover
John C. Hooversworth
Carlton V. Howard, Jr.
Robert W. Howard
Finley N. Hubbard, Jr.
Franklin M. Hundley
John J. Hunt
William R. Hurley, Jr.
Charles R. Hurst
Charles E. Hutchison
Cecil R. Hutchison, Jr.
Philip W. Hyatt
James P. Jackson, Jr.
Michael Jasperson
Edward M. Jennings III
Samuel L. Jennings
Eugene T. Jilg
Donald M. Johnson
Henry C. Johnson
Richard B. Johnson
Robert A. Johnson
Robert O. Johnson
Ivan R. Johnston
Duane C. Johnstone
Colin M. Jones
Courtney S. Jones
Daniel F. Jones
Thomas N. Jones
Dennis R. Jordan
Steven A. Jordan
William M. Jordan
Joseph I. Judge
James R. Julian
Edward R. Kaiser, Jr.
John N. Kalberg
Beau K. Kansteiner
Ernest W. Karger
Alfred L. Kasid, Jr.
David P. Kassoy
Richard A. Kauffer
Richard T. Kaupie
Thomas L. Keaveny II
Francis J. Kelliher
Lawrence P. Kelliher
Augustus G. Kellogg, Jr.
Edward W. Kelly
Hugh F. Kelly
Donald E. Kentopp
Jonathan M. Keyes
Russell S. Kifer, Jr.
Wayne D. Kilgore
Robert C. King
William D. Kinsley
William P. Kirk II

John C. Kirscher	William C. McWhorter	Calvin A. Olano, Jr.	Karl G. Scheetz	Manly P. Thornton	William R. Westlake
Joseph D. Kirschten	George E. MacCubbin, Jr.	Joseph R. Olson	John J. Schell	Melvin C. Thornton	Mathias J. Wey
Donald S. Klein		Oscar W. Olszewski	Parley G. Schenk	David E. Thoun	John M. Whalen
Wallson G. Knack	Donald R. MacDermott	Stafford N. Ordahl, Jr.	Ralph O. Schenk	Ronald E. Tietz	Gerald A. White
Richard N. Knight	Richard W. MacKay	Peter C. Osborne	Joe D. Schilling	Calvin L. Todd	Ray J. White
Richard W. Knorr	John W. MacKnight	Joseph F. O'Sullivan	Preston G. Schiowitz, Jr.	William M. Tolle, Jr.	Robert B. White
Richard J. Kolodziej	Robert D. MacNish	Theodore C. Palen	John E. Schlapkohl	Richard S. Tompson	Harry E. Whitelock
Richard L. Komp	John Macrae	Philip Palmer, Jr.	Raymond G. Schliesman	Morton E. Toole	Gregory L. Whitlinger
William J. Kooyman	Richard J. Madara	Richard A. Palmer	Kenneth L. Schnelder	Audrice R. Traylor, Jr.	Ralph R. Whitney, Jr.
George E. Kopp	Rolf V. Mahler	Stanley B. Palmer	Thomas J. Schoen	Edmund B. Treidler	James B. Whittaker
Robert W. Kopp	Irwin R. Major	Arthur J. Pancook, Jr.	Carl H. Schrank	Clifton R. Tucker, Jr.	William K. Wible
Michael B. Kraft	Donald B. Malcolm	Harry L. Parker	Walter H. Schwartz, Jr.	David C. Twesme	Robert H. Wichmann
Robert M. Kraft	Frank Mallette	Walter W. Parker III	John R. Schwemer	Paul D. Vance	Malcolm H. Wiener
Richard A. Kreitzberg	Charles A. Malmberg	David N. Parks, Jr.	Lawrence J. Scott	James W. Vaughan, Jr.	Francis A. Wiesner
Robert C. Krickhaus	Emil D. Malmquist	Angelo L. Pastore	Robert S. Scott	John J. Veak	Luke J. Wilburn, Jr.
Edwin H. Krieg, Jr.	Robert A. Mammano	Stewart K. Patberg	Thomas D. Scott	Eugene B. Veek	Bruce T. Willey
Thomas A. Kriz	Richard D. Mann	Robert C. Paton	Cornelius D. Scully III	Edward L. Velden	Thomas G. Williams
Eugene R. Krueger	Thomas A. Manz	Dale W. Patterson	William P. Searcy	Alex J. Viessmann	Bruce D. Wilson
Richard F. Kruppa	William D. Marsh	Ralph A. Patterson, Jr.	James G. Seely, Jr.	James C. Vohr, Jr.	Stuart M. Winkler
John F. Kuhn	Harris A. Marshall, Jr.	Noel L. Peacock	Herbert E. Seglehorst	William A. Wallace	Arthur R. Wise, Jr.
Paul R. Kulka	William G. Marshall	Peter B. Perry	Frederick W. Seibold	Thomas F. Wallace	Lawrence E. Witmer
Karl R. Kullander	Albert J. Martin	John R. Peters, Jr.	Carwin "Y" Self	Donald F. Walter	Robert J. Wolfe
Larry D. Kunkel	James A. Martin	Melvin L. Peterson	Norman D. Self	Thomas V. Wambach	Roderic L. Wolfe
Thomas M. Kurihara	William J. Martin, Jr.	Wade J. Pharis	Kent S. Seymour	Newton E. Ward, Jr.	David G. Wood
Theodore H. Kurtz	Joel D. Marvill	Lindsay F. Phillips	Stanley S. Shaw	David R. Warnock	Joseph M. Woods III
William P. Kurtz	Raymond E. Matthei	David C. Pierson	James R. Shea	Harold W. Waterman	Thomas B. Worthen
Roger N. Kust	Nick N. Matthews, Jr.	Lawrence L. Pillsbury	Edwin A. Shelley, Jr.	John A. Watson	Joseph A. Worzala
James D. Laing	Kenneth A. Maxwell	Richard H. Pletcher	David L. Sherck	John W. Watt	Paul I. Wren, Jr.
Richard E. Landry	Paul L. Maycock	James D. Pope	Gary G. Sick	Robert B. Watts	Robert J. Wright
Edward M. Lang, Jr.	Allen Mead	Henry C. Porter	Harry M. Slegmund	Charles H. Weaver	Kenneth R. Yenni
William R. Lang	Louis D. Megehee, Jr.	Edward C. Prettyman	Richard L. Sorsby, Jr.	Donald E. Weaver	Hugh L. Yoho
Rudolph S. Langer	Elbert L. Menees, Jr.	Charles F. Price	Wilson E. Southern	Charles Webb III	Robert B. Young
Paul B. Lansing	David L. Mericle	Mebane M. Pritchett	Barry F. Smith	James M. Weiffenbach	William M. Younger
Donald K. Larsen	Lawrence F. Merriion	James E. Prock	Charles P. Smith, Jr.	Robert P. Well	John A. Zachman
Donald R. Larson	Paul A. Meschler	Peter N. Puerling	Clarence E. Smith, Jr.	Robert M. Welner	Raymond A. Zambrano
Jon M. Larson	Paul M. Mettert	Robert W. Puschinsky	Dean L. Smith, Jr.	Raymond G. Weinmann	Richard N. Zelle
Alan W. LaRue	Nathan Metzger III	Harry S. Quast	Fred E. Smith, Jr.	Edwin A. Weise	Carlo F. Zezza, Jr.
William W. LaRue	Donald W. Meulbroeck	Gerald T. Quenell	Glenn A. Smith	Francis J. Weller, Jr.	James F. Ziegler
James W. Lauer	Robert F. Michel	Gerald T. Quigley	Jimmy F. Smith	Robert E. Welsch	David E. Zweifel
Casimir E. Lawler	Harold E. Miller	George M. Quint	John B. Smith		
James C. Lawrence III	Max K. Miller	Kenneth D. Rakouska	Robert E. Smith		
Raymond Q. Lawrence	Wayne W. Miller	Herbert G. Rammrath	Ronald D. Smith		
Donald M. Laws	Robert W. Minnerly	Robert F. Randall	William J. H. Smithey		
Alan E. Lazar	Ralph C. Mitchell III	John T. Ratliff, Jr.	Samuel J. Smock		
Robert A. Leavenworth	Robert D. Mitchell, Jr.	Peter V. Raudenbush	Joseph Smotzer, Jr.		
Jamil G. LeBlanc	David B. Moffatt	David R. Rawson	Robert J. Smythe		
Melvin E. Lehman	Anthony J. Monteleone	John R. Reardon	William F. Snell		
Paul E. Leitzinger	Philip M. Moody	James D. Rees, Jr.	Roger W. Staehle		
Paul R. Leopold	Donald L. Moore	Joseph A. Reich, Jr.	Harrison I. Steans		
John D. Lethco	Anthony M. Moore	Richard Reichler	Dwight O. Stedman		
Robert L. Leuschner, Jr.	Thomas R. Moore, Jr.	Richard M. Reische	John R. Stephens		
	John W. Moran, Jr.	Thomas F. Reiser	Leon M. Stevenson, Jr.		
	Edward A. Morgan	George H. Reisner	John E. Stewart		
	Ronald S. Morris	Tracy V. Remy	Francis J. Steyer		
	John H. Morrison	Edward J. Rice	William A. Stoodt		
	William J. Moyer	Edward F. Richards, Jr.	Roland L. Strausbaugh		
	Bruce B. Mudge	James H. Richards	Richard R. Stuart		
	Denis A. Mueller	Ralph Richter, Jr.	Wilton Sturges III		
	Myron J. Mumaw	William A. Ringer	James F. Sullivan, Jr.		
	Robert E. Mumford, Jr.	Robert T. Ritchey	John B. Surret		
	David R. Murphy	David B. Robbins	William R. Sutherland		
	Gerard F. Murphy	Gary L. Roberts	Harold J. Sutphen		
	John F. Murphy	Harry D. Roberts	Christopher F. Sutphin		
	Nicholas M. Murphy	Paul E. Roberts	Andrew L. Swallows		
	Ronald D. Murphy	Rex W. Roberts	Floyd C. Swan		
	John A. Murray, Jr.	Ian E. G. Robertson	Edward W. Swanson, Jr.		
	William D. Myers	John A. Robertson	David P. Swanson		
	Larry D. Nace	Gene A. Robinson	Thomas D. Swepston		
	Kenneth E. Narehood	Ronald K. Robinson	Ernest G. Szoke		
	Ronald B. Natalie	David M. Rockmore	Jack F. Talbott		
	Marcus E. Nellums, Jr.	Alexander M. Roe	William E. Tangney		
	David O. Nelson	Emmon S. Rogers	Jerome K. Tankel		
	Robert B. Nelson	Thomas E. Rohricht	James C. Tappan		
	Sydney B. Nelson	Clifford C. Roltsch	Peter R. Tatso		
	James E. Nevitt	Stephen E. Rosenthal	John N. Taussig		
	Lino G. Niccoli	Norman A. Ross	Douglas G. Taylor		
	Julian C. Nichols	Wendell R. Ross	Robert M. Taylor		
	Lee H. Nichols	Alyn Rovin	Robert P. Tema		
	Francis E. Niering, Jr.	William A. Rucker	William J. Texido		
	William P. Nilsson	Roger L. Rue	Edwin R. Thiele		
	James S. Noblitt	George W. Ryan	George F. Thoman, Jr.		
	John K. Nolan	Joseph A. Ryburn	David D. Thomas		
	Gene O. Nommensen	Alexander M. Salley	George M. Thomas III		
	Lee E. Norton, Jr.	Glenn A. Saltzman	Larry D. Thomson		
	Gary R. Nuss	Steven M. Sandlin			
	Frederick W. Nutt	George D. Sauter			
	Francis E. O'Connor	David T. Savage, Jr.			
	Otis L. O'Connor	Gerald K. Scales			
	Paul O'Connor	Dennis N. Schafer			
	Robert E. O'Connor				
	Allan W. Okins				

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert B. Abele	Robert S. Friedman
Frank J. Adelman	Archibald Gann, Jr.
Bruce W. Avis	Harvey N. Herstein
Richard L. Battelle	John A. Jordan, Jr.
Swinton B. Burkhalter	Garnett L. Keith
Richard A. Butler	Charles R. Koppa
James E. Carpenter	Larry G. Laycock
Frank R. Cepel	James H. Malecki
Hugh B. Cowan	James E. Martin, Jr.
Fred Cowley	Paul J. Martineau
James J. Craig	William A. Meeker
Claudius S. Dawson, Jr.	Robert A. Ogletree
Arthur P. Dayries	Joseph K. Pinnell
Robert B. Farris	Ronald D. Robinson
Donald J. Fint	James W. Ross
Robert N. Flinn	James F. Wilson
Robert L. Fowler, Jr.	Paul H. Zuckerman

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy, and to be promoted to the grade of lieutenant when their line running mates are so promoted, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Howard Alleman	Ronald R. Cameron
Arthur O. Anctil, Jr.	Alfred R. Chappelka, Jr.
Robert F. Anderson	Maynard S. Christian
William V. Applegate	Edmondson F. Coil
John A. Arness	Marvin E. Collettine
Robert M. Baird	Terry M. Collier
Robert F. Baker	Ralph D. Comer
William J. Baker	Theodore J. Cosgrove
William M. Bason	Frederick J. Cremona
John H. Beaumier	Richard K. Cureton
Byron L. Beddo	Jere J. Daum
James L. Beeby	Bruce K. Defebere, Jr.
Fred L. Benoit III	Michael F. Dolan
Harold E. Bergee	William C. Douglass
James J. Blemer	Robert C. Elliott
Robert S. Boring	Eldon L. Evans
Ronald L. Bouterie	Fred S. Evans
Charles E. Boylan	George A. Ferré
Herbert E. Brooks	John R. Finch
Frank S. Bryan	Albert L. Folkner
John B. Burr	Ralph M. Fortenberry
Donald R. Cagle	

William J. Fouty
James H. Gallant
Nicholas A. Garcia III
Allyn E. Gilbert
James T. Gillespie, Sr.
Edwin P. Gramlich
Edward D. Greaves
Donald H. Greene
Thomas P. Hamilton II
James E. Hansen
Jude R. Hayes
John E. Hester III
Jon K. Hillis
Howard S. Irons
Stephen H. James
Stephen J. Kendra
Francis L. Klingler, Jr.
Robert W. Knapp
Henry D. Knox
David H. Kohl
Jack A. Langevin
Donald T. Lansinger
Willard A. E. Larson
Robert Littlejohn
Albert G. Loew, Jr.
Denton E. MacCarty
Gilbert I. Madison, Jr.
James J. McHale, Jr.
George J. McMahon
Raymond E. Merrill
George E. Metz
Johnny E. Milner
Murray G. Mitts
Jerome H. Modell
Ross B. Moquin
Robert K. Norton

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Lieutenant commander

Donald H. McLean.

Lieutenant

Edwin R. Carnes.
Charles E. Pohl.
Charles A. Rockwood, Jr.

Jeanette C. Opsahl, woman (civilian college graduate), to be a lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named Reserve officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Commander

Rosario A. Fischella,
Wendell A. Johnson.

Lieutenant commander

Harold R. Noer

Lieutenant

Louis C. Alala
James A. Austin
Frank M. Barnwell
Paul R. Bauer
Joseph F. Bayer
James C. Bellamy
Daniel G. Bitner
Charner W. Bramlett
William F. Brunner
Frederick S. Caldwell
Philip K. Carter, Jr.
Pat A. Cato
John W. Coles, Jr.
Nelson T. Debevoise
Hugo S. DeLuca
Gerald F. Dobel
Thomas G. Doneker
George J. Ellis, Jr.
Hugh E. Fraser
Dudley J. Gaekle
Henry L. Giard
Lucius A. Harrison, Jr.
George R. Hart
Henry T. Haye

The following-named Reserve Officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of

O'Tar T. Norwood
James L. Okel
John B. Oldershaw
Andrew Olesjuk
Andrew M. Pardue
Stanley R. Payne
John M. Pearson
Richard L. Rogers
William A. Royer
Ellsworth J. Sacks, Jr.
George F. Sengstack
Guy A. Settipane
Alvin A. Shackner
Edward J. Sheldon
Norman L. Sims
Joseph L. Sirolis, Jr.
Alvin J. Southworth
Kenneth F. Spence, Jr.
Robert E. Strange
Fred J. Svendsen
Lawrence Sweeney
Ives C. Thillet
Philip J. Torsney, Jr.
Monroe E. Trout
Richard C. Trump
Sidney Tolchin
Peter F. D. VanPeenen
Daniel V. Voiss
James B. Wade
Kenneth E. Wagner
Edward B. Weiss
Gerald Weitzman
Robert A. Williams
George H. Wood III
Ronald H. Woody, Jr.

the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Lieutenant

Theodore A. Bodine
Joseph R. Bohacek
Alfred O. Brault
Donald J. Cody
James E. Corthay

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy, and to be promoted to the grade of lieutenant when their line running mates are so promoted, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert W. Allen
Doil E. Barlow
Paul L. J. Bradford
George R. Butler, Jr.
William L. Comcowich
George B. Cross
Charles J. Cunningham
Charles R. Diem
Ronald N. Dodds
Albert M. D'Onofrio
Richard C. Edwards
Robert K. Fenster
John T. Forte
Arthur M. Gensior
Roy F. Gherardi
Dan C. Gholson
Norman B. Giles
Richard J. Good
Charles J. Grady, Jr.
David M. Grove
Dale F. Hands
Robert J. Harland
Robert D. Heckel
Robert L. Hill
John H. Jayne
Harris M. Kimbrough, Jr.

The following-named Reserve officers selected as alternates to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy, and to be promoted to the grade of lieutenant when their line running mates are so promoted, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Vincent A. Amicucci,
Marvin J. Molacek.
James P. Toyias.

William R. Yarwood for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer W-2, in the United States Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following women officers of the Naval Reserve to be appointed in the permanent grade of lieutenants in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Italina Di Giambattista.
Helen F. Maurer.

The following women officers of the Regular Navy to be appointed in the permanent grade of lieutenant in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and reappointed to the temporary grade of lieutenant commander, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Bertha I. Alvord
Thelma R. Bare
Mary E. Crenshaw
Ruth L. Flickinger
Florence M. Frazier
Muriel Hanwell

The following women officers of the Regular Navy to be appointed in the permanent grade of lieutenant in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Minnie D. Banko
Marion D. Bates
Mary E. A. Bisenius
Blanche E. Boumel

Mildred Chapulis
Mary E. Darling
Delima M. M. Dumas
Ruth E. Fabian
Mary C. Grosz
Jane Higginson
Florence G. Lahey
Georgia M. McKearly
Maurine M. Meckes
Barbara Munroe
Helen T. O'Brien

Elizabeth O'Malley
Mary M. Opsuth
Margaret L. Rafferty
Emma G. Robinson
Elaine O. Rosevear
Anna Stankavitch
Alice Q. Steele
Ella M. Vick
Dorothea H. Wheeler
Evelyn D. White
Muriel M. White

The following woman officer of the Regular Navy to be appointed in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and reappointed to the temporary grade of lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Betty D. Bair.

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

Lieutenant

William H. Albertson
Richard C. Allen
Roy L. Beavers, Jr.
Joel H. Berry, Jr.
Earl C. Bowersox, Jr.
George W. Bruce, Jr.
Eugene R. Burdon
Albert L. Chandler
Donald E. Clark
Edward A. DeFelice
Donald E. Erwin
Richard M. Fletcher
Philip G. Griffith
Joseph E. Guion
Brian K. Hannula
Richard B. Hartigan
Phil "R" Hawkins
Harold J. Hilz
Joseph M. Husbands
George M. Johnson
Donald E. Jubb
Karl E. Kuehner
Marion G. Lamb
John L. Langston

Robert E. Lavender
Billups E. Lodge
Robert G. McCausland
Isidoro Maggay, Jr.
Thomas H. Mathews
Edward H. Monroe, Jr.
William E. Nyce
William H. Pierce, Jr.
Michael C. Pouls, Jr.
Donald J. Renz
William R. Rugg
Anthony D. Sesow
Maurice J. Shine
George C. Sibert
James D. Taylor, Jr.
Kenneth G. Thomas
Herman L. Turk
Robert J. Wallace
Richard B. Walls
Albert C. Wartman, Jr.
Thomas W. Watson
James D. Wolf
Donald P. Zeithaml
Robert J. Zemaitis

Lieutenant (junior grade)

John P. Baumgartner
William J. Belay
Charles F. Cook
Martin F. Corcoran
James A. Crider
Norman E. Davis
Arthur H. Eagan
Edward S. Fitch
John W. Grunenwald
Richard L. Hill
George C. Hogan
George A. House, Jr.

Robert S. Jackson
Robert Kerr
John W. Rustin, Jr.
Francis H. Scherer
Ralph A. Smith III
Louis W. Stevens
Richard A. Stratton
Richard W. Stuebben
Walter Sturm
Gerald C. Vaught
Richard M. Weber

The following-named for permanent appointment:

Lieutenant

Arthur W. Cleveland
John R. Ditore
Harry B. Eills

Leonard B. Szatkowski
Richard T. Whitlock
Ned E. Wick

Lieutenant (junior grade)

William H. Albertson
Richard C. Allen
Alexander R. Andersen
Roy L. Beavers, Jr.
Clifford L. Bekkedahl
Joel H. Berry, Jr.
George L. Boaz
Earl C. Bowersox, Jr.
Cloyde I. Brown
George W. Bruce, Jr.
William J. Buc
Eugene R. Burdon
John W. Cade
Albert L. Chandler
Donald E. Clark
John B. Dana
George K. Davis
Edward A. DeFelice

Richard T. Dreghorn
Richard H. Engelbrecht
Donald E. Erwin
Richard M. Fletcher
Edward I. Fox
Pat M. Garner
Timothy P. Gentry
Charles A. Gray
Philip G. Griffith
Joseph E. Guion
Brian K. Hannula
Stanley J. Harms
Thomas K. Harrison
Richard B. Hartigan
Eugene F. Hartnagle
Phil "R" Hawkins
Harold J. Hilz

Edward S. Hosepian
Clifford R. Hubbard, Jr.
Joseph M. Husbands
George M. Johnson
Donald E. Jubb
Jack M. Kennedy
Wilbert A. King
Steven E. Kish
Karl E. Kuehner
Manford D. Kuttler, Jr.
Marion G. Lamb
John L. Langston
Robert E. Lavender
Billups E. Lodge
Robert G. McCausland
William A. McWaters, Jr.
Chester M. Mack
Isidoro Maggay, Jr.
Stanley J. Marks
Thomas H. Mathews
Donald M. Metzler
Edward H. Monroe, Jr.
Houston M. Morgan
William L. Morris
Richard Nielsen
William E. Nyce
William T. Owens
James E. Perkins
Joseph "A" Perkins
Thomas M. Pieper
William H. Pierce, Jr.
William R. Pettyjohn

Michael C. Pouls, Jr.
Richard P. Ralph
Donald J. Renz
John W. Roberts
William R. Rugg
John N. Ryan
George A. Sawyer, Jr.
John J. Scully
Anthony D. Sesow
William J. E. Shafer
Maurice J. Shine
George C. Sibert
Wayne L. Stephens
Joseph E. Sullivan, Jr.
Jerry G. Swor
Benjamin E. Tabler
James D. Taylor, Jr.
Richard "Z" Test
Kenneth G. Thomas
Herman L. Turk
Christopher R. Vatisdis
Robert J. Wallace
Millard L. Wallen, Jr.
Richard B. Walls
Charles W. D. Ward, Jr.
Albert C. Wartman, Jr.
Thomas W. Watson
Alan L. Weeks
Richard W. Wells
James D. Wolf
Donald P. Zeithaml
Robert J. Zemaitis

Ensign

John P. Baumgartner
William J. Belay
Leslie E. Breeding
Eugene A. Cernan
Charles G. Chisholm III
Claude D. Clower
Charles F. Cook
Martin F. Corcoran
James A. Crider
Norman E. Davis
Arthur H. Eagan
Edward S. Fitch
Charles L. Fuld
John W. Grunenwald

Richard L. Hill
George C. Hogan
George A. House, Jr.
Robert S. Jackson
Robert Kerr
John W. Rustin, Jr.
Francis H. Scherer
Ralph A. Smith III
Louis W. Stevens
Richard A. Stratton
Richard W. Stuebben
Walter Sturm
Merrill L. Talbott
Gerald C. Vaught
Richard M. Weber

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy (special duty law), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

Lieutenant

Thomas F. Hairston.
Savas Hantzes.

The following-named for permanent appointment:

Lieutenant (junior grade)

Savas Hantzes.

Ensign

Thomas F. Hairston.

The following-named women officers for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Lieutenant

Marie A. Cardani.

Lieutenant (junior grade)

Ann E. Carter
Nancy L. Denton
Betty J. Dew

Janet E. Horgan
Margaret J. Merritt
Beverly F. York

Ensign

Kathleen A. Bashe.
Julia J. DiLorenzo.
Janet K. Tandy.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Lieutenant (junior grade)

Elmer E. Inman, Jr.

Ensign

James G. Wilcox.

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

Lieutenant

Robert L. Brunson
Charles F. Carpenter

John H. Dunlevy
Rial C. Jones

Lieutenant (junior grade)

Ronald B. Goodman.
Richard F. Wilson.

The following-named for permanent appointment:

Lieutenant

Perry E. Baunsgard.
Harold C. Duessel.

Lieutenant (junior grade)

James A. Breit
Robert L. Brunson
Charles F. Carpenter
John H. Dunlevy
Rial C. Jones

Lawrence E. Krukin
John J. Lyons
Charles L. Rush
Thomas L. Schanz

Ensign

Ronald B. Goodman.
Richard F. Wilson.

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

Lieutenant

Eugene T. Flatley
Thaine E. Ford

Martin F. Gibbons
Chester R. Weber

The following-named for permanent appointment:

Lieutenant

Vincent M. Smith.

Lieutenant (junior grade)

Eugene T. Flatley
Thaine E. Ford

Martin F. Gibbons
Chester R. Weber

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following named for temporary appointment:

Lieutenant

Vytautas B. Bandjunis.

Lieutenant (junior grade)

Willard G. Shafer.

The following named for permanent appointment:

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Vytautas B. Bandjunis.
Kenneth J. Kristiansen.
Richard E. Skogsberg.

Ensign

Willard G. Shafer.

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following named for temporary appointment:

Lieutenants

Marie A. Croteau
Rosemary Davis

Mona L. Filler
Marguerite J. Racek

The following named for permanent appointment:

Lieutenants

Ruby M. Brooks.
Martha J. Meyers.
Margaret F. Neely.

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Marie A. Croteau
Rosemary Davis

Mona L. Filler
Marguerite J. Racek

The following-named to be temporary ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification deck, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

William J. Adkins	Bernard M. Hillman
Neil J. Amero, Jr.	James K. Ingalls
Richard T. Baldwin	Freddie "L" Jones, Jr.
Gordon J. Barclay	William P. Karmenzind
Maurice J. Barrett, Jr.	Herman S. Kunz
Ralph I. Bertelsen	Travis H. Laird
Paul G. Bowser	Joseph W. Lauf
Randolph M. Brown	William J. Leonard
Stanton L. Brown	William E. McGuirk
Richard J. Bussmann	Vito J. Monteleone
Clarence Buyers	Lester A. Morgan
Frederick J. Casselberry	Burton C. Newby
Thomas B. Clark	Lawrence B. O'Brien
Billy W. Cummings	Frank P. O'Keefe
Joe W. Eaton	Jack L. Patterson
Jeremiah Edwards, Jr.	Ronald F. Petty
George Fondren	James L. Putman
William R. Forte	William F. Rogers
Robert A. Giovanetti	Donald C. Ruthford
Jack L. Godfrey	Paul J. Santoro
Joseph G. Gofus, Jr.	Warren B. Shearon
William M. Greaney	Robert E. Sheelor
Lawrence E. Harkins	Carl J. Weidetz, Jr.
George C. Hebble, Jr.	Richard L. Welch
William L. Henderson	Joseph A. Winkler
	Soi Young

The following-named to be temporary ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification ordnance, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Francis A. Adamcewicz	James B. Haralson
Thomas R. Allen	Howard J. Hardenstein
Russell S. Ault	William J. Humphrey
John G. Bornowski, Jr.	John R. Hurd
Samuel L. Bouton	George F. Jenkins
William R. Boxwell	Oscar F. Luedtke, Jr.
Clarence E. Brown, Jr.	John J. Peterman, Jr.
Edward H. Cahill	Benjamin W. Randie
Wade A. Cole	Earl L. Roberts
William J. Cranford	Laverne W. Speed
Raymond Cross	Edward L. Stockhausen
Robert L. Davis	David W. Strunk
Garnett D. Duncan	George W. Sturdivant
Peter Edwards	William T. J. Swayne
Morton B. Fine	Russell G. Teague
William K. Garrett	Robert L. Thompson
Bernie L. Green	Robert R. Wall
Frederick "G" Grisbaum	Donald Ward, Jr.
Stephen J. Grosscup, Jr.	William D. Watkins
	George Zwirlein

The following-named to be temporary ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification administration, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Frank H. Abbott	Roy C. Morrow
Joseph D. Adams	Harold W. Nall
Harris Barnett	Kenneth C. Nielsen
Byron A. Blount	Lester W. Notbohm
Roland I. Bruning	Orville E. Painter
Calvin E. Burdett	Newell D. Park, Jr.
Arthur E. Chayer	Bobby J. Pigg
Harold E. Coburn	Ralph S. Poole, Jr.
Dana P. Covert	Donald J. Pouliot
Dean F. Flickinger	Charles A. Roll
Richard H. Fulfer	Kenneth M. Roxburgh
Emmett T. Guindon	Cleveland H. Russell
John K. Harley	Allred Sistrunk, Jr.
Milam B. Hassey	Joseph R. Starr
Albert L. Heffernan	Homer H. Sullivan
James W. Hood, Jr.	Maurice S. Syverson
Raymond E. Inman	William H. Tebbetts
Francis P. Jones	John W. Thompson
Paul B. Kincade	Carl L. Vancil
Ellis R. Lamb, Jr.	Kenneth E. Vann
William E. Landon	David B. Venable
David C. LeBlanc	Harry E. Wagner
Lloyd R. Lemerande	Joseph A. Worral
Paul W. Martin	Arthur E. Young, Jr.
Lloyd H. McGraw	

The following-named to be temporary ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited

duty only, classification engineering, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Lee R. Anderson
William J. Bartee
John H. Beahm, Jr.
Wesley L. Bennett
Dean T. Blakeslee
Wayne A. Braastad
John W. Brannin
James V. Brewer
Charles W. Brink
Howard S. Brown
Edward J. Cameron
Richard D. Canter
Albert J. Carr, Jr.
William F. Cole
Raymond L. Curry
James G. Davison, Jr.
Lester C. Dowling
Francis T. Duba
Thomas J. Elliott
John K. Epley
William H. Evered
Richard C. Fleming, Jr.
Roger W. Fuller
Stanley W. Gardner, Jr.
George M. Giganti
Roy D. Gomer
Charles A. Gossard
Charles D. Griswold
Matthew W. Gunder-
sen
Frances M. Harper, Jr.
Leroy M. Hayden
Roscoe Hayter, Jr.
Eugene L. Hill
Albert L. Hoffman
John D. Jacobs
Donald G. Jefferson
Arthur L. Jewell
Harvey E. Jewell
Jesse H. Lafever
Russell J. Larkin
Carl H. Long, Jr.
Harlen J. Martin
Thomas G. McFarland, Jr.
Charles R. McIntire
Alton L. McKelthan
Robert N. McKeon

Laurence V. McNamara
Robert E. McPherson
Vincent R. Medugno
Robert L. Meenan
George L. Meisner
Bernard G. Morris
Munir A. Moyer
John J. Nania
William J. Nelson
William J. Nott
Rex G. Nunnally
William M. Patrick
Wayne M. Pierce
Robert E. Priest
Robert A. Quick
Vito N. Ragone
Billy R. Randolph
Joseph W. Reck
William J. Reno
John T. Reynolds, Jr.
Eugene Richter, Jr.
Doyle C. Robbins
Melvin D. Romero
Thomas E. Sayers, Jr.
Tom R. Sibson
William E. Silvey, Jr.
Bennie J. Smith
Jimmie E. Spear
Virgil E. Springer
Henry R. Strangfeld
Paul C. Stroup
Lester R. Sunda
Charles N. Swahn
Harold L. Thompson
Victor G. Thorp
William C. Toney
Raymond L. Urry
James J. Ward
Conrad W. Weiser, Jr.
"J" "B" Whitaker
Benjamin F. Whitmer
Teddy P. Wilkison
Maurice D. Willyard
Warren C. Wilson
John D. Wood
Lawrence G. Yessak
Edward C. Yuskis

The following-named to be temporary en-
signs in the line in the Navy, for limited
duty only, classification hull, subject to
qualification therefor as provided by law:

Chester L. Arnett
Ernest P. Blanton
Wayne E. Coltrin
Eugene Dootson
Carl Gibson
Benjamin W. Jones
Allan E. Lipke
Wallace F. MacLeod, Jr.
David B. Michael
Dehlbert C. Michel
Raymond K. Mullaly
"H" "O" Mutz, Jr.
Lawrence A. Papi
Herbert T. Randall
Harold J. VanOstrive
Clarence G. Waldner
Frank J. Woldyla

The following-named to be temporary en-
signs in the line in the Navy, for limited
duty only, classification electronics, subject
to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John C. Alexander, Jr.
Archie A. Anderson
George E. Anderson
Robert B. Armbruster
Einar W. Backstrom
Lawrence Bates, Jr.
Robert J. Beckman
Leland "S" Beedle, Jr.
Benjamin M. Bishop
Sela A. Blaisdell
Joseph N. Brand
Lawrence H. Carter
Arthur R. Caudry
John D. Clark
Robert E. Corsnitz
John A. Craven
Richard D. Crumm
James R. Dayhoff
James M. Dearman
Joseph F. DelRoss
Thomas E. Dimond
Melvin J. Edwards

James C. Evans
Elbert W. Fairies
Robert W. Felts
Franklin E. Ferguson
Cecil O. Fields
Donald L. Frear
Charles A. Fuller
Merton E. Gaudette, Jr.
George A. Gellenthin, Jr.
Winton S. Gessner
Donald "C" Gibson
Ernest E. Guilmond, Jr.
Stanley J. Hall
John R. Harrington
Donald H. Hewett
Robert C. Heyde
Delbert F. Heydenberk
Robert E. Hills
Benjamin Horn

Charles E. Houck
Frank A. Howard
Robert L. Hughes
Philip H. Jacobsen
John L. Jennings
Edward D. Johnson
Roy L. Jones
Henry W. Kassler, Jr.
Charles A. Kennedy, Jr.
Wayne P. Keyes
James "J" Kilmer
John W. King
Loren L. Kuske, Jr.
William J. Lang
Harvey D. Lasko
Donald W. Little
Robert A. Lockshire
Rudyard K. Loose
Richard M. Lufkin
Harold R. Markley, Jr.
Charles B. Megyesi
John F. Merry
Joseph M. Murphy
John Nonni, Jr.
Roy A. Norman
John B. O'Brien
Walter H. O'Brien
Earl L. Oliver
Albert J. Pappas

Robert A. Parsons
Irwin B. Pierson
William C. Pioske
Lloyd E. Polk
Roger E. Prenzlow
Harold W. Rachell
Denny R. Rathbun
Bernard S. Reitmeyer
Edgar E. Richmond
William E. Riley
George L. Roberts, Jr.
Robert D. Robertson
Larry R. Rodke
Robert R. Sanborn
Paul H. Sayles
Peter J. Scheidt
Walter H. Sharp
Leonard T. Smith
Carl T. Snyder
Robert F. Sterling, Jr.
Maurice M. Stickney, Jr.
Louis J. Torres
Gordon E. Townsend
Earl V. Tracy
Theodore J. Vroman, Jr.
Eldon C. Wilson
Billie R. Young
Robert M. Zurluh

The following-named to be temporary en-
signs in the line in the Navy, for limited duty
only, classification aviation operations, sub-
ject to qualification therefor as provided by
law:

James L. Albritton
Hubert E. Brainard
Harold D. Carder, Jr.
"W" "L" Lamon
Crouch
Richard C. Farrell
Harry A. Folkins
William H. Foukl
Paul J. Keegan
John A. Landaker, Jr.

William T. Long
Rex A. Maddox
Dean E. Nordell
Ull G. Rabb
Frederick A. Shaw
Phillip H. Skiff
Morris K. Terry
Ray A. White
Peter A. Wiktorski

The following-named to be temporary en-
signs in the line in the Navy, for limited duty
only, classification aviation ordnance, sub-
ject to qualification therefor as provided by
law:

Earl W. Achord
Aquila J. Allen, Jr.
Edwin C. Beach
Donald J. Brough
Donald C. Dodd
Joe L. Dyer, Jr.
Raymond E. Engle
John D. Evanoff
Bernard M. Fitzgerald
Edward F. Gold

Frank W. Huseman, Jr.
Jay D. Koehler
Roy R. Lewis, Jr.
Robert W. Morgan
Benjamin F. Schultz, Jr.
Charles R. Walton
Carl C. Wells, Jr.
Alfred H. White

The following-named to be temporary en-
signs in the line in the Navy, for limited duty
only, classification aviation maintenance, sub-
ject to qualification therefor as provided
by law:

Robert N. Ball
Joseph S. Bouchard
Allen E. Brady
Joseph C. Bures
Morris C. Carter
Walter R. Coe
Joseph J. Cosgrove
Homer B. Dally
Chester L. Fitzpatrick
Cecil H. Fleming
Ralph A. Goslin
Irving G. Hall III
John F. Hill
William G. Holland
Walter Hopwood, Jr.
Alton J. Huth
Stephen D. Keir
Howard Kelso
Eugene J. Kozak
Frank A. Lastrico
James J. Lynch
Roy T. Magnuson
Clayton C. Mamele
Robert F. Marshall

Roger A. Mathieu
Joe B. McInvale
George W. Miller, Jr.
Herbert E. Montgom-
ery
John T. Moore
Kenneth P. Mullins
Addison W. Newton
Edward "B" Nohlburg
Robert A. Peirson
Samuel B. Phillips
Edmund A. D. Piasecki
Nicholas T. Potts
Kyle T. Prevost, Jr.
Howard V. Richard-
son, Jr.
Richard T. Schoon-
over
Bradford K. Shaffer
Robert H. Smith
Donald G. Stanfield
John S. Thompson
Russell W. Wright

The following-named to be temporary en-
signs in the line in the Navy, for limited
duty only, classification aviation electronic,
subject to qualification therefor as provided
by law:

Clarence M. Ammons
Robert M. Archibald
Ronald W. Arenth
Harry J. Baker
Albert Barre
Harry O. Baumgartner
William C. Bibbee
Raymond L. Blazevic
James R. Blum
Richard W. Blumen-
thal
Arnold E. Boyster
James K. Brackin
Joseph L. Buechel
Mitchel T. Burchfield
Albert G. Bush
Lowell E. Bush
David I. Byers
Lloyd B. Camp
James P. Carl
Wayne D. Carpenter
Joseph W. Carroll
Charles S. Carter
Samuel M. Chavar
Wiley J. Cheek
Frank J. Cheney, Jr.
Lyle E. Y. Clarke
Robert A. Clary
Harry B. Clay, Jr.
James G. Cocchi
Paul T. Cook
Raymond L. Crinfield
Earl H. DeEsch
Norman L. Denoon
William E. Dishon
Joseph F. Doherty
John J. Donnelly
Joseph D. Driscoll
Charles E. Dunn
Robert A. Duvall
Robert L. Dygert
Donald L. Edwards
Richard B. Ehrhart
William B. Elliott
William T. Fenton, Jr.
Leo G. Ferlet, Jr.
Walter E. Frank
Harold A. Fredericks
Joseph Gass
Byron A. Gaudry
Francis Gorecki
Robert F. Hagen
Michael F. Hannify
Joseph E. Haralson
William L. Harkness
John R. Harkreader, Jr.
James O. Harris
Carl L. Hawkins
William E. Heppard
Paul J. Heying
Frank C. Holland, Jr.
Norman H. Johnson
Paul C. Johnson
Clarence A. Johnston
Wayne R. Kelley
Martin S. Kennedy
Aubrey V. Kesterson
William A. Kivelle

Robert G. Kofnovec
Edwin L. Krause
John A. Laboone, Jr.
Donald R. Larkin
Edward E. Lesko
William T. Martin
Ralph A. Matarazza
Richard T. Mayer
Willard L. McCollough
Robert S. McDaniel
Donald C. McIntyre
Patrick J. McIntyre, Jr.
Harry McKay
Edward W. McKinnon
David R. McKnight
Daniel J. Million
Edward Mills
Marvin L. Mills
Raymond A. Mosman
William Murdoch
Richard D. North
Arthur L. Northrop
John J. O'Donnell
Joseph D. Olson
Cecil W. Painter
Harold P. Pruitt, Jr.
Thomas H. Raspberry
Ned W. Reed
Robert W. Repp
Oscar "G" Rice
Charles A. Roberts
Robert W. Roman
Daniel P. Roper
Herman E. Roy
Edward A. Sailor
Edford W. Sapp
Bill W. Sharp
Joseph Shipman
Roy A. Sloan
Lewis F. Smith
Thomas E. South-
worth
Charles E. Spitzner
Donald O. Stansbury
Zachary Steine
Raymond L. Steven-
ton
Joel Stowers
George R. Stradley
Junior C. Sturm
Clarence S. Swaringen, Jr.
Harry D. Truitt
James G. Tylee
Frank C. VanDoren
William H. Vaughn
James A. Victor
John Wagner
Muthy D. Walker, Jr.
Audrey C. Webster
Robert W. White
William A. Wilkerson
Charles L. Williams
Van E. Williams
Kenneth D. Wright
Walton E. Yates
Anthony J. Zorbach
Ralph M. Zuver

The following-named to be temporary
ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited
duty only, classification aerology, subject to
qualification therefor as provided by law:

Jack V. Baldwin
George Bernstein
Thomas D. Deagan
Frederick F. Farns-
worth
Chester J. Fields, Jr.

Arnold W. Pruitt, Jr.
Robert B. Roberson
Ralph W. Sallee
Marion R. Thompson
George C. Underwood

The following-named to be temporary
ensigns in the Supply Corps in the Navy, for
limited duty only, subject to qualification
therefor as provided by law:

"D" "C" Agee
Thomas C. Andersen

Leo R. Ayers, Jr.
Howard J. Barbary

Thomas S. Beaman
 Ralph W. Bell, Jr.
 Thomas Benvenuto, Jr.
 Christian L. Broxterman
 Jerry R. Chambers
 Roy F. Christian
 Floyd E. Combs
 Richard D. Costa
 Lawrence D. Crutchfield
 John H. Dietz
 Maurice E. Dixon
 Dale E. Dodson
 James L. Erickson
 Elton B. Fitzgerald
 Robert U. Frankeny
 John J. Gettrige
 Allen Hardy
 Richard R. Hendren
 Elmer G. Hunt
 Rutherford E. Hunt
 Raymond E. Hutton, Jr.
 Floyd L. Irvin
 Carl F. Irving, Jr.
 Harold B. Itzkowitz
 Vernon R. Jenkins
 Nels P. Jensen
 Theodore G. Lister

The following named to be temporary ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps in the Navy, for limited duty only, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Clarence E. Loomis.
 William J. Schoenholzer.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Cash, Eugene J.
 Cassidy, Thomas J., Jr.
 Dee, Orson R.
 Detonnancourt, Arthur E.
 Dick, Joseph L.
 Duckering, Donald W.
 Evans, George J.
 Farnham, Charles G.
 John, Robert P.
 Lilling, Wilbur
 Ludwig, George E.
 Mathews, Donald W.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the grade of ensign:

William A. Bair
 Maurice R. Berdan
 Donald L. Conner
 Theodore M. Edson
 Aaron B. Jacobs
 Stephen D. Love

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Alfred J. Adkisson, Jr.
 Charles A. Augustine
 Earl R. Allen
 Norman D. Allsworth
 Robert H. Andrews
 Robert E. Bancroft
 Kline P. Barney, Jr.
 William H. Barutio
 Kent C. Bateman
 William D. Beaty
 Francis W. Bell
 Donald R. Binns
 William H. Bond, Jr.
 Frank R. Black
 Joseph P. Borland
 Jerry D. Boulton
 Gene E. Brennan

Richard A. Martell
 Orville D. Matthews
 Mason B. McClure
 Robert H. Moore
 Allen R. Murphy
 Bartholomew Pacofsky
 William H. Parke, Jr.
 Michael Pata
 Loyal B. Pettypool
 Richard A. Reese
 Colonel P. Robinson
 Robert P. Rose
 Arthur Roth
 Harold R. Schoolcraft
 Rodney K. Squibb
 Robert H. Stead
 Donald Stripling
 Alex E. Swartz
 Dwight O. Thietten
 Philip L. Tilley
 Ralph A. Utrup
 Louis E. Vann
 Howard A. Vincent
 James V. Voegel
 Paul D. Walker
 Johnnie R. Weaver
 Harry G. Webster
 Don J. Wiggins
 George W. Worth

Robert L. Cochran
 John C. Cooper, Jr.
 Eric W. S. Craig
 Stanley R. Currey
 Martin J. Dalquist
 Robert D. Davis
 Hollis E. Davison
 William D. Dobrowolski
 Cyril W. Doyle
 Robert C. Duval
 Emory S. Evans
 Charles S. Edwards
 Edward H. Ernst
 John F. Flynn
 Paul C. Flattery
 John W. Fowler
 Matthew Flessner
 Irving L. Fuller, Jr.
 John W. Futrell, Jr.
 George A. Gale
 Robert E. Garcia
 Richard T. German
 James R. Ginn
 Victor H. Golletz
 William L. Goodwin
 Bradford Gorham
 Orrin R. Gore
 Walter D. Gould
 Otis L. Graham
 Dean W. Graves
 Glenn R. Grosch
 Richard A. Gustafson
 Donald A. Haldi
 Donald D. Hall
 George L. Hammond
 Spent M. Hansen
 William J. Hatcher, Jr.
 Robert E. Haverkamp
 David R. Hines
 Marvin E. Hoffman
 Robert C. Hooper, Jr.
 Bert G. Hornback
 David W. House
 Robert G. Jensen
 Edward T. Johnson, Jr.

Richard R. Johnson
 Allan E. Jones
 George T. Jones
 Richard O. Jones
 Frank Junger
 James R. Jurecka
 Paul F. Kahn
 Francis M. Kauffman
 Robert Keeney
 Morris C. Kellett
 John A. Kirchner
 Donald U. Kreppel
 Basil L. Kristoff
 Timothy B. Lecky
 David J. Leighton
 John J. Liati
 John M. Lilla
 Claude M. Linford
 A. Michael Lipper
 Charles F. Lloyd
 Basil M. Long
 Hugh M. Lovejoy
 Thomas F. Lowe
 Robert G. Lucas
 William R. Lutes
 John B. McIlhenny
 John F. McManus
 Colin R. McMillan
 Michael J. McTighe
 Donald E. Machenberg
 Malcolm L. MacKay

The following named (meritorious non-commissioned officers) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Thomas P. Angus
 William S. Bates
 Herman D. Batson
 Daniel J. Blaul
 Robert P. Brooks

Carter G. Mackie
 Max L. Mardick
 Benjamin J. Mason
 Gerald J. Massey
 Jacob T. May
 James G. Meador
 Richard O. Merritt
 Donald C. Mikulecky
 John G. Miller
 Louis L. Morgan
 William R. Murray
 Benjamin F. Napheys

III
 Nelson M. Olf
 James W. Orr
 Lionel J. Parrish
 Roy A. Patterson, Jr.
 John T. Peavey
 William P. Peterson
 John J. Pikel, Jr.
 Woodrow W. Pitt, Jr.
 John C. Pollock
 Samuel G. Putnam, Jr.
 Richard B. Quanrud
 Radford M. Reams, III
 Paul E. Ridge
 Robert D. Ritchie
 James Y. Robertson
 Robert K. Rushin
 Ivan K. T. Samsonoff
 Robert H. Schuppe
 Frederick W. Searby,

III
 John P. Senik
 Robert B. Shepard, Jr.
 Thomas F. Sheppard
 David K. Silhanek
 Tommy J. Silver
 Roger E. Simmons
 Robert L. Sindelar
 Francis Sistrunk
 Robert H. Smart
 Robert E. Swartwood, Jr.
 Gareth W. Smeltzer
 James B. Smiley
 Brock R. Snyder
 Dwight T. Sorenson
 Lloyd G. Spivey, Jr.
 Henry C. Stackpole, Jr.
 Carl M. Stephens
 Edward L. Stowe
 Warren J. Strausser
 Henry W. Streitman
 Anthony R. Stringer
 Charles S. Stubin
 Norman F. Suedekum
 William L. Sullivan
 Richard F. Swift
 Carl G. Tebbe, Jr.
 John F. Thelen
 Carl R. Thomas
 John M. Tivnan
 Paul G. Toxie
 William P. Trower
 John S. Vogt
 Samuel F. Wells, Jr.
 Edward A. White
 Larry R. Williams
 Morris M. Williams
 Charles P. Williamson
 Douglas N. Wilson
 Phillip A. Wittmann
 Benjamin H. Woodbridge, Jr.
 David H. Wright
 George P. Wuerch
 Fred A. Wulff, III

Vernon E. Firnstahl
 George L. Gardner
 Gordon D. Gore
 Charles H. Gullett
 Robert L. James
 Peter J. Johansen
 Christian F. Kiene
 Charles S. Lawson
 Paul F. Lessard
 Joseph P. Marada
 Bernard McMahon

The following-named (Naval Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Roy F. Arnold
 Robert R. Babbitt
 John H. Baer
 Owen C. Baker
 Ernest F. Baulch
 James D. Beans
 Randolph M. Browne

III
 Joseph B. Byrnes
 Carl R. Chelius
 Richard F. Chenault
 Walter T. Chwatek
 Robert C. Cockell
 Donald B. Conaty
 Donovan F. Duggan
 James C. Eddins
 Clarence Fong
 Hadley C. Ford, Jr.
 George R. Frank, Jr.
 Charles D. Goddard
 William S. Hamel
 Kenneth P. Harrison
 Richard T. Hart
 Thomas W. Haven
 Charles H. Heiden
 Donald L. Hicks
 Jon D. Hollabaugh
 Larry T. Ingels
 Angelo M. Inglis
 Redmond R. Jensen
 William B. Jessup
 Duncan H. Jones
 Michael J. Kelly

The following-named (Army Reserve Officers Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Joe E. Carmack.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Nicky C. Davis
 Charles R. Haggood
 James D. Pierce
 Ernest A. Schwab
 Howard L. Snider

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John E. Bates
 Robert W. Bartsch
 Wallace J. Butler
 John J. Caldas, Jr.
 Donald S. Carr
 Robert M. Cook
 Frank T. Crews, Jr.
 Terry L. Eikenberry
 William G. Ficere, Jr.
 Robert A. Freeman
 Donald J. Hatch
 Richard B. Hohman
 Perry L. James
 Lester E. Johnson
 Jack D. Jorgenson

Harold R. McSweeney
 Richard S. Pyne
 David R. Ramzel
 William P. Redding, Jr.
 Joseph E. Revell
 Robert E. Rutherford
 Gaetano F. Squillace
 Russell P. Treadwell
 Richard C. Wells

Robert W. Layer
 David R. Mabry
 James F. Maguire, Jr.
 James A. McGinn
 David S. McIntyre
 Joseph W. Monteith
 Harold M. Nelson
 Peter F. Neumann
 James C. Norton
 Richard H. Oates
 Paul M. O'Brien, Jr.
 John W. O'Donnell
 Jerry D. Peterson
 Earl S. Piper, Jr.
 Allen I. Price, Jr.
 George N. Robillard, Jr.
 William J. Rodenbach
 Robert P. Rogers
 Paul E. Roush
 James E. Royer, Jr.
 Conrad J. Samuelsen
 Richard H. Sargent
 David P. Smalley
 Stanley L. Smith
 William J. Tirschfield
 Chester J. Tricca
 Samuel M. Trippe
 Pedro R. Vazquez
 George F. Warren
 Mark H. Waterbury III
 Harry E. Wells

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 15, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor, World Affairs, Carrolton Manor, Md., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, author of life and of love:

Let the light of Thy countenance shine brightly upon the Speaker of this House and all the Members of the United States Congress.

Grant, we beseech Thee, special divine favors for the President of the United States and other leaders who have achieved a moral miracle in building bridges of friendship among all the 21 Republics of the Western Hemisphere.

Inspire all these peoples and their government officials to speak and to act in such manner that the good-neighbor values that have been developed over recent decades may be expanded and strengthened.

Do Thou, dear Saviour, in Thy generosity and goodness, inflame the hearts and souls of the sons and daughters of America, who will be the lay and religious leaders of the future, a profound love of the ideal of inter-American understanding and devotion.

Vouchsafe, we beseech Thee, a renewed spirit of loyalty and confidence, excluding all indications of animosity, strife, or ill will.

In this critical hour, when freedom is threatened on every continent, preserve our minds and our hearts in sentiments consecrated to truth and fairness.

We implore all these graces in the name of our beloved Redeemer, the Christ of the Andes. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 11, 1957, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, a concurrent resolution, and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4271. An act to provide that the Delegate from Alaska in the House of Representatives of the United States may be a member of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission;

H. R. 6092. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Merrimack River flood-control compact;

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

H. J. Res. 279. Joint resolution authorizing the procurement of an oil portrait and marble bust of the late Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which

the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 126. An act for the relief of Ljubischa Nikolich;

S. 130. An act for the relief of Frosso Spiliotou;

S. 161. An act for the relief of Elias Youssef Mikhael (Ellis Joseph Michael);

S. 248. An act for the relief of Herta Kubelle Shields;

S. 249. An act for the relief of Theodora Hegeman;

S. 251. An act for the relief of Edith Elisabeth Wagner;

S. 253. An act for the relief of Josef Michael Adolf;

S. 257. An act for the relief of Petronella Elisabeth Deimbeck Major;

S. 268. An act to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall return certain mineral interests in land acquired by him for flood-control purposes to the former owners of such land;

S. 368. An act for the relief of Jose Medina-Chavez (Joe Medina);

S. 385. An act to authorize the training of Federal employees at public or private facilities, and for other purposes;

S. 438. An act for the relief of Paul Er (Ear) Chen and Lydia Chen, nee Shih Ming Chung;

S. 523. An act for the relief of Nicolaos Papathanasiou;

S. 560. An act for the relief of Alec Ernest Sales;

S. 570. An act for the relief of Jeannine Therriault Grantham;

S. 771. An act for the relief of Rebecca Erriete Mustacchi;

S. 973. An act for the relief of Yun Wha Yoon Holsman;

S. 987. An act for the relief of Leonardo Finelli;

S. 998. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1953 (67 Stat. 41), and for other purposes;

S. 1002. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to desert-land entrymen to the same extent as such assistance is available to homestead entrymen;

S. 1171. An act for the relief of Harry Siebert Schmidt;

S. 1192. An act for the relief of Irma B. Poellmann;

S. 1202. An act for the relief of Arsene Kavoukdjian (Arsene Kavookjian);

S. 1203. An act for the relief of Lydia Anne Foote;

S. 1212. An act for the relief of Evangelos Demetre Kargiotis;

S. 1346. An act for the relief of Jane Bailey (nee Jane Dzun Ma);

S. 1360. An act for the relief of Mrs. Geraldine Elaine Sim;

S. 1412. An act to amend section 2 (b) of the Performance Rating Act of 1950, as amended;

S. 1521. An act to exempt persons appointed to student trainee positions from the provisions of section 9 of the Civil Service Act prohibiting the employment in the classified service of more than two members of the same family;

S. 1832. An act to authorize the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of State; and

S. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report 139, entitled "Technical Assistance."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4813) entitled "An act to extend the life of the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked

by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MORSE, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States No. 57-9.

THE UNITED STATES ARMY CONGRESSIONAL COMMAND AND OPERATIONS GROUP

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress who hold active United States Army Reserve or National Guard commissions have long felt a need for some means of maintaining their Reserve status in good standing. Congressional staff members are in exactly the same position.

Recognizing this need, the Department of the Army has now organized a Reserve training unit which will be titled "The United States Army Congressional Command and Operations Group."

This unit will conduct training assemblies once weekly while the Congress is in session. Assemblies normally will be conducted on a designated morning at 0830-0930 hours. The initial meeting, which will be an organizational meeting, will be held this Wednesday morning at 0830 in the House caucus room.

I have been assured by the Army that these training assemblies will be stimulating, informative, educational, and up to date. The program affords an excellent opportunity to a Reserve officer to keep up his Reserve status and interests with minimum interference with congressional duties.

Participation in this unit will be on a nonpay basis. Members of the Congress who hold commissions in the Ready, Standby, or Retired Reserve of the Army or who are commissioned in the National Guard, are eligible for membership in the unit. Staff members of congressional committees and staff members of individual Congressmen who are commissioned in the Reserve components are invited to participate. Membership in this unit will not sever affiliation of the member with his home unit. The Department of the Army will insure that individual records of members will continue to be kept in their present home Reserve unit and credit for participation in the congressional training unit will be entered in the records of their home unit.

ANTIDEFICIENCY ACT

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the \$41 million deficiency appropriation should be approved quickly by Congress so that full postal service can be restored throughout the Nation. We cannot abide ill-considered "meat-ax" cuts vitally affecting thousands of families whose breadwinners are postal employees, as well as the millions of postal patrons who are entitled to rely on the mail service which has been established.

However, the Postmaster General should resign. I said so at the outset of this hassle; I say so again now, as do the Detroit Times and other leading newspapers, along with a number of Congressmen, including my friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, JOHN LESINSKI, Democrat, who is a senior member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which committee I am also a member.

Now, did the Postmaster General violate the antideficiency law? Yes, says the Comptroller General in an opinion written April 12, 1957. He violated subparagraph (c) (1), which requires him to make the money appropriated to his Department last for the full year without the necessity of a deficiency appropriation.

The law provides no penalty for the violation of this section. I intend to introduce an amendment to provide for the same penalty applicable for violations of paragraphs (a), (b), and (h) of the Anti-Deficiency Act.

My considered opinion, as a lawyer, is that Mr. Summerfield violated paragraph (h), for which paragraph the penalty is, upon conviction, a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both. His guilt, of course, must be determined by a court. Therefore, I am turning over a copy of this statement to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia with the request that he take appropriate action and in due course advise me. I personally do not believe Mr. Summerfield should be fined or imprisoned, in view of the fact that there have been previous unprosecuted violations of the Anti-Deficiency Act, although it appears that none was so gross, so flagrant and so arrogantly carried out as the instance before us. In any event, if he were convicted, the matter of punishment would be for the court to decide.

All that I am saying as a lawyer is that there is a basis for prosecution.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PAN AMERICAN DAY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to a resolution providing that the House of Representatives designate Monday, April 15, 1957, as the date to celebrate Pan American Day, on which day appropriate remarks on the occasion may occur, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks immediately following the remarks I am about to make; and also that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this subject matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 232) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas April 14, 1957, marked the 67th anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union, now the Secretariat of the Organization of American States; and

Whereas the legislatures of the 21 American Republics have traditionally observed April 14 as Pan American Day; and

Whereas the House of Representatives, ever since the founding of the Pan American Union, has encouraged the development of inter-American cooperation and friendship in recognition of common interests and aspirations of the peoples of this hemisphere; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extend its greetings of most cordial friendship and highest regard to the representative bodies of each of the other American states on the occasion of Pan American Day, in recognition of our common purpose to achieve the goal of solidarity through voluntary cooperation in mutual freedom and good will.

Copies of the present resolution shall be distributed through appropriate channels to the legislatures of the other American states and to the Secretary General of the Organization of American States.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to call the attention of the House to the 67th anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union. Last week all of the independent Republics of this hemisphere observed Pan American Week, and yesterday, April 14, was Pan American Day. Due to the fact that the House could not be in session yesterday, we have postponed official recognition of this important event until today. The United States shares with the other American Republics a sense of gratification at this evidence of the feeling of unity on the part of our neighbors in this hemisphere. It is important that we this afternoon by formal action give evidence of our awareness of our common interest and common heritage to the other members of the Pan American Union.

It seems to me that our annual observations of Pan American Day resemble in many ways the observation of a birthday in a typical family here in the United States. Certainly our relations with our sister American Republics are essentially a family relationship. Nature and tradition have bound us to each other by special ties and have made us

especially dependent on one another. In a sense all of the American Republics were born into the same household and are aware that their destinies are intermingled.

Just as the members of any family tend to take each other for granted most of the time, I think that it is true that in certain respects the nations of this hemisphere are inclined to take each other for granted. But just as a birthday celebration in a typical family gives evidence to one member of the family of the respect and appreciation of the rest of the family, even though that member has been pretty much taken for granted during the rest of the year, it seems to me Pan American Day gives us an opportunity to show to each other our gratitude for friendship and cooperation and our consciousness of our dependence on each other.

We are all aware of the many things which the American Republics have in common. I am sure that our institutions and outlook tend to become more alike each year. Nevertheless, it seems to me that the very marked differences that exist among us point to one of the most significant aspects of our relationship with each other. Certainly we all recognize that we are different in many ways, some of which are fundamental and obvious. Some of the nations of this hemisphere are large, others are small; some are rich and others are relatively poor. A number of the American Republics have undergone a substantial industrial development, while others are almost entirely agricultural. We are all aware of the fact that we do not have a common language. In some countries an overwhelming majority of the population has a European ancestry, while in others the overwhelming majority finds its roots entirely in this hemisphere. The basic legal systems of some countries are different from the rest. There are a number of other points of difference which all of us recognize.

The point I want to make, however, is that, in spite of these important differences, we in this hemisphere seem to have worked out procedures for getting along with each other, and these procedures seem to work better every year.

I think we all expect nations and people that are pretty much alike to get along well with each other. But, in my opinion, the biggest problem confronting the world today is to devise measures by which nations and people that are not alike can develop methods of settling their differences and avoiding controversy. The American Republics found out long ago that it is impossible as well as undesirable to try to make all nations conform to the same pattern. We have learned that we have to accept each other as we are and that our points of view and national interests will inevitably be different in important respects.

The world as a whole is just becoming aware that it must face the same realities. The world is aware that we on the two American Continents have made great progress in dealing with such matters. The Pan American Union is the oldest international organization in existence. The basic principle of the

North Atlantic Treaty had previously been embodied in the Rio Treaty of 1947. The concept of point 4 had already been in successful operation for years in Latin America before it was extended to the rest of the world by the United States and by certain programs of the United Nations.

The American Republics can be gratified that our experience has served as a guide to the world in the past, and I am sure that the nations of the world will continue to observe and to benefit from our experiences.

I think our experience with the United States aid to Latin America is particularly interesting and significant. It may well give an indication of the course to be followed in the development of our programs in other parts of the world. In the 10 years since the end of World War II the United States Government has made grants to the American Republics to a total of \$673 million. In addition to this, loans of our Government to Latin American governments have reached a total of \$1,333,000,000. Altogether this amounts to \$2,006,000,000 of United States Government money which has gone to the American Republics during the postwar period. One of the most interesting aspects of these expenditures is the fact that roughly two-thirds of the total was made available on a loan basis. It should be noted also that nearly half of the grants, that is, \$316 million was for military aid.

Let me call to your attention an aspect of our aid program to Latin America which is frequently overlooked. We have during the ten years since the war received a total of \$821 million from that area in the repayment of principal and interest. Of the total loans of \$1,333,000,000 which we made to that area, almost 50 percent have now been repaid. The outstanding debt of the American Republics to the United States is only \$79 million.

I think that the Members of this House may all derive satisfaction from the fact that during the fiscal year 1956, the last year for which complete data is available, the total grants made by the United States to the American Republics were \$111 million. But as against this amount, the United States received from the countries of Latin America \$164 million in the payment of principal and interest on previous loans. We have today reached the stage where we are actually getting back from the American Republics on our previous loans to them more than the current grants which we are making to them.

I mentioned a moment ago that the total outstanding debt of the American Republics to the United States is \$709 million. We all recognize that this is a substantial sum. On the other hand, I am sure that many of us are not aware of the fact that the total investment in Latin America of the United States business enterprises is \$7 billion. In other words, there is 10 times as much United States capital being used in Latin America by private enterprise as is currently available there as a result of Government loans.

It is particularly significant, I think, that this very substantial capital invest-

ment in Latin America has not resulted in a drain on Latin American resources in order to make payments to the United States. A survey which has just been completed by our Department of Commerce indicates that the American firms which have made a total investment in the American Republics of \$7 billion are paying each year \$1 billion in taxes to the governments of the countries in which they operate. Let me point out that this \$1 billion which United States firms pay in taxes exceeds the total outstanding debt of Latin American governments to the United States, which is \$709 million, and may well be contrasted with the total payment of interest and principal made by the governments of the American Republics to the United States last year of \$164 million.

I have cited these figures, Mr. Speaker, in order to make clear that the United States has undoubtedly made a substantial contribution to the economic development of our pan-American neighbors. It is important to note, however, that by far the greatest share of this contribution has been in the hands of American business enterprises which have come to occupy an important and permanent place in the economies of the countries in which they are located. In the second place, it is significant that a very large proportion of the funds which have been supplied to the American Republics by our Government have been made available on a loan basis and that of these loans almost 50 percent have been repaid.

It seems to me that we may hope that our assistance to nations in other parts of the world with their economic development may be similar. Certainly we want to cooperate with them and to make capital available to them when we can be sure that it will be effectively used. At the same time, we are well aware that the best evidence of the success of such a program is the fact that private enterprise is willing to make substantial investments in the area and that money supplied by our Government is being used so effectively that the nations using it are able to pay it back.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should congratulate all of our sister Republics of this hemisphere and ourselves as well on the happy relationship which has developed during the 67 years since the Pan American Union was founded. I think we have every indication that we are on the right track and that we may all derive increasing satisfaction from succeeding anniversaries of this happy event.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I am so glad that my distinguished friend has brought this resolution to the floor. I have listened with keen interest to his very fine statement. I think it most significant that this is the oldest organization of States that is in continuous existence. Here in this hemisphere we find our best friends and here in this hemisphere we find the greatest promise of the future. I think it very commendable indeed that

the House pause to pay particular respect to this day.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I join with my friend from West Virginia in the very fine remarks he has made on this occasion.

Sixty-seven years ago today delegates to the First International Conference of American States gathered in Washington, D. C., at the Wallach Mansion on the corner of 18th and I Streets NW., and laid the foundation for the mighty Organization of American States.

The meeting resulted from a growing conviction that the American Republics have much in common and could prosper through collaboration. Simón Bolívar, as early as 1823, had envisioned the mutual benefits to be reaped from a spirit of cooperation among the young nations of the New World. By 1889 the concept of inter-American fraternity had taken firm root in American thinking both north and south of the Rio Grande. Of the 19 American States existing at that time—Cuba and Panama were not yet independent—all except the Dominican Republic, whose agreement with the United States dated from 1884, cordially accepted a United States invitation to hold a conference aimed at strengthening inter-American ties.

The conference took several steps which foreshadowed later developments in our continental system. In the first place, it condemned conquest in the American Republics. Secondly, it adopted a comprehensive plan of arbitration. But these were lofty conceptions that had to wait until the American system ripened. The third step taken by the conference, however, proved to be of lasting significance. On April 14, 1890, the delegates agreed to establish a permanent organ of inter-American cooperation. Called the Commercial Bureau of the Americas, the first permanent machinery of the inter-American system had the sole function of collecting and distributing commercial information. But the very fact of its continual existence soon made it the nucleus upon which later attempts to improve pan-American relations could build.

The great Elihu Root, in a prophetic address to the delegates to that first pan-American meeting, captured the essence of their accomplishment. Said he:

We hail you, gentlemen, not only for the immediate results which we expect from this international conference, but for the bright promises of the future. The vision of one generation is the project of the next, the project of this generation is the accomplished fact of the next; the fact of this generation passed into history with the next, and all the world wonders that men have so long been blind * * *. You gentlemen who participate in this conference between all the peoples of the free Western Hemisphere are the advance guard in the greatest movement since civilization began toward the brotherhood of man and the federation of the world.

Sixty-seven years later we can testify to the accuracy of Root's prediction.

One generation, then another, have built upon the groundwork laid by the distinguished delegates to that First International Conference of American States. Over the years the inter-American system has grown and gained vitality. It has endured two tragic World Wars and outlived the League of Nations. The spirit of harmony and cooperation it fosters among the American family of nations reduces tensions and mistrust that otherwise might riddle America as they have other parts of the world.

At the same time, the practice of working together has strengthened the sister nations in their resistance to threats from abroad. The American Republics drew together when the totalitarian Axis Powers threatened to destroy the freedom of nations. Now, communism, national and international, menaces the freedom and peace of the free world. The Communist threat is virulent and persistent. In its path, the 21 American Republics stand solidly together, determined to assist one another to retain the freedoms and democratic traditions that all hold dear.

On this the birthday of our inter-American system we can look back with pride on the unique peace apparatus conceived and developed in the Western Hemisphere. Nevertheless, our generation cannot relax in satisfaction at the handiwork to date. By renewed devotion to the ideals of pan-Americanism, we must strive to ever strengthen the bonds of inter-American solidarity.

From the practical standpoint, inter-American friendship and solidarity can help us win the current struggle for human freedom. The agents of Marxism-Leninism are active in the Caribbean, in Central America, and on the South American Continent. As an elementary principle of prudence, every United States citizen can ask himself what would be gained by the subversion of any Republic in the Western Hemisphere? Do we not know that the Marxists and the Leninists always disturb the peace and fish in troubled waters? When trusted, responsible friends are under fire, what have we to gain by promoting confusion, anarchy, and chaos? Thanks to the union of hearts and minds achieved in World War II, we know our allies and our allies know us. We must maintain this union, in the light of our own vital interests.

In conclusion, I would like to record my joy that, thanks to the courtesy of our beloved Chaplain, the Members of the United States House of Representatives have joined in the prayer on Pan American Day as offered, for the 13th consecutive year, by a man of God who is a friend of us all, Father Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of *World Affairs*. It is our own prayer that Father Thorning, loyal friend that he is, may be preserved for many years to continue his apostolate of friendship among our good neighbors.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, Pan American Day is an anniversary which all of us in the United States can observe with gratification. Although our country is confronted with serious problems and grave threats in many parts of the world, we can derive confidence from

the fact that in the Western Hemisphere events are moving in the right direction.

I do not mean to say that the American Republics have solved all of their problems or that there are no controversies among us. Certainly every one of the countries on this side of the Atlantic has serious internal problems. We all recognize that in certain of the Pan American nations the standard of living is much too low and that an all-out effort must be made to bring about an improvement.

Nevertheless, the American Republics as a group find themselves in a favorable economic situation and the statistics show that the standard of living of the Latin American countries is increasing at the rate of 2½ percent a year. This is higher than the annual rate of increase of our own standard of living.

We should not shut our eyes either to the fact that the nations of this hemisphere have differences with each other. We in the United States find that there are areas of disagreement with certain of the nations to the south.

The fact remains, however, that in this hemisphere we have an old well-established working organization for dealing with our common problems and for working out solutions to matters of disagreement. We also have a tradition for bringing our international disputes to the membership of the Organization of American States for consideration and a feeling of confidence that no disagreement will be so serious that a solution by peaceful negotiation cannot be found.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on this 67th anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union, it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleagues of the House in extending to the other nations of this hemisphere the greetings of the United States and give them assurance of our continued good will.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join in this anniversary occasion with the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the chairman of the American Hemisphere Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, with whom on that subcommittee I have the honor to serve.

The idea of pan-Americanism goes back to the time of the first inter-American Congress in Panama in 1826. Simón Bolívar who was mainly responsible for urging this gathering of American States visualized the possibility of a permanent Pan American Union. It was his belief that such a confederation would promote inter-American peace and security.

It was not until 1890, when the first Conference of American States was held in Washington, that Bolívar's dream became a reality. It was at this conference that the foundation of pan-Americanism was laid with the formation of the Pan American Union. This union was formed on the Bolivarian ideals of inter-American cooperation based on peace, freedom, and justice.

Later conferences added to the strength of the growing "House of the Americas." Finally, at Bogota in 1948, the Ninth International Conference of American States gave permanence to the structure by establishing the Organization of American States. In the charter

of this organization, the American Republics reaffirmed their desire to live together in peace; to respect each other's sovereignty; to provide for common action in case of aggression; and to promote, by collaboration, their economic, social, and cultural development.

This growth of pan-Americanism is tangible evidence of the desire of the American people to live and work with their American neighbors. It shows that we abandoned any thoughts of intervening in the internal affairs of our sister Republics and rather have recognized the sovereign equality of our good neighbors.

Today, on the anniversary of Pan American Day, all Americans can look with pride on the accomplishments of the pan-American system. Within the framework of Pan Americanism, we have succeeded in bettering the health and living conditions of our neighbors; we have developed their resources and economy; and we have successfully maintained hemispheric peace and security.

I am confident that pan-Americanism which is based on the sovereign equality of all American States and has promoted fellowship and mutual cooperation among its members in the past will continue to grow and to contribute to hemispheric welfare and solidarity in the future.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, California was first founded by Spain and Father Junipero Serra, who established California's many missions, is one of the State's heroes. These men from Spain brought to California the same traditions and systems of law they brought to Central and South America during the Spanish colonialization period. California was once a part of Mexico, and then an independent republic under the bear flag before it became a part of the United States. The ties of California with Latin America today remain as close as those of any region of our land.

In consequence, it is highly fitting that this year the Ambassadors of the American Republics chose to celebrate Pan American Day by a visit to California. I am inserting below editorials from the *Los Angeles Times* and *Los Angeles Examiner* commenting on the event. These editorials, however, fail to mention a most singular event in the Ambassadors' tour of California. That is the Pan American Festival at Lakewood, Calif., at which the Ambassadors were feted by a luncheon and were distinguished guests for a parade last Saturday.

The city of Lakewood and its citizens are no newcomers to the enhancement of good relations between the United States and her neighbors to the south. For over 10 years the community has honored and forwarded friendship between the people of the United States and the peoples of Latin America by an annual Pan American Day Festival and Parade. Each year one country has been singled out for special attention, which includes the formation of special contacts between Lakewood and one of the cities of that country, together with a similar specific contact between Lakewood's schools and schools of that country. So successful has Lakewood conducted these efforts that last fall the

community and its citizens were honored to receive the United States Information Agency's special award of merit for outstanding services forwarding the President's "people to people" good-will program.

With the participation in this year's events at Lakewood of the Ambassadors of the American States, further recognition of the value of Lakewood's contributions to International solidarity in the Americas has been afforded. Although the success of the Lakewood Pan American Festival and Parade is due to the untiring efforts of many, special notice should be given to Mr. M. H. Jennings, president, and Mr. William S. Walker, vice president, of the Pan American Festival Association, which shouldered the major responsibility for conducting the ceremonies and festivities at Lakewood.

The editorials I referred to previously are as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Examiner]

PAN AMERICAN DAY

It is singularly fitting that today's celebration of Pan American Day is being formally celebrated in the cities of San Francisco and Los Angeles, and graced by the presence in California of the Ambassadors of the 21 American Republics which constitute the Organization of American States.

This is the first time since the founding of pan-Americanism in 1890 that observance of the event centers in the westernmost State of our own Union.

This circumstance vividly reminds the peoples of the New World of the historic links that bind the Commonwealth of California with our neighboring nations of Hispanic origin and culture.

That memory is, of course, everpresent with us. The poetic and sonorous names of California, San Francisco and Los Angeles alone suffice to establish the tie of a common past and inspire the confidence of enduring fraternity.

This sentiment is based on some facts of deep significance that are sometimes overlooked in the hurlyburly of workaday affairs, sometimes obscured by small differences that rise naturally among members of an active, creative family.

But the differences seem trivial indeed in the light of the positive beliefs that unite the sovereign states of the Western Hemisphere.

These are easily defined: A passion for liberty, both individual and collective; a deep faith in the same God and the same Saviour; recognition of the principle that the freedom of each member is essential to the freedom of all.

This has been true since George Washington and Simón Bolívar, liberators of the two great branches of the American people, both stated it clearly and firmly.

In modern times it was emphasized by Herbert Hoover during his good will tour of Latin America, before he took office as President of the United States.

More recently, the increasing exchange of goods and ideas, of cultures and arts between American nations, has helped to cement the aims of statesmanship with the realities of friendly personal relations.

With these proofs of mutual respect and trust between the New World nations uppermost in mind, The Examiner welcomes and salutes the American Ambassadors and, through their good offices, the great peoples they represent.

[From the Los Angeles Times]

GOOD NEIGHBORS GETTING TOGETHER

Whenever good neighbors get together there is the inspiration for a celebration.

And such a happy event is taking place here this week because it is the privilege of Los Angeles to be host to representatives of 19 out of 21 American Republics.

IMPORTANT VISITORS

The distinguished delegation arrived by plane yesterday and is on a steady round of entertainment building up to the climatic observation of Pan American Day Sunday.

Eighteen Ambassadors of the 21 nations comprising the Western Hemisphere were in the group welcomed at the airport by Mayor Poulson, many city officials, and civic leaders. The presence of the Ambassadors attests the importance of the occasion.

The Americas have much in common and meeting in an atmosphere of friendship and cooperation is the ideal way to promote their collective interests. Foremost is the hope that the 340 million persons in the Western Hemisphere can cross cultural differences and boundaries to become a united community.

In the 67 years since pan-Americanism has been in operation a dependency between the nations has been established. Today the Organization of American States, the sponsor of Western Hemisphere advancement, possesses an enviable record.

ENVIALE RECORD

Wars have been reduced to the vanishing point, defensive measures have been instituted for collective security, and inter-American trade is steadily increasing. The enormous exchange of products has reached \$8 billion annually and is increasing.

On the agenda for consideration are the peaceful use of atomic energy, promoting trade, eradicating of diseases, reduction of illiteracy, stimulating agricultural and industrial development, intensifying the existing technical cooperation program, construction of low-cost housing, and completing the inter-American highway system.

The matter of defense also gets continuous study and planning. The agreement is that an attack upon one shall be accepted as aggression against all. The ability to work together was shown in World War II when most of the Americas allied themselves with the United States following Pearl Harbor.

During the conflict Latin America provided 75 percent of the foodstuffs and 40 percent of the raw materials imported by the United States. The relationship has grown in importance since then and today Latin America furnishes 30 out of a total of 77 strategic materials listed for stockpiling in this country.

EARLY CHAPTERS

The New World has a fine list of successes to its credit, but there also are differences to be resolved. The story of solidarity is still in its early chapters even though the prolog was written 131 years ago by Simón Bolívar, the "George Washington" of the Latin American Republics.

He called the first meeting of the Americas for Panama City in the summer of 1826. Only four governments, Colombia, Peru, Mexico, and the Central American Federation, took part. The others ignored the invitation or were not able to send delegates.

A political storm blew up in Washington over proposals to be presented. By the time fears of entangling alliances were soothed it was too late for delegates to reach Panama City. What a far cry that is from today's realization that the whole of the New World is one community in many respects.

This year's pan-American ceremonies are more widespread than before. Pan-American Day Sunday will be the first to be observed by the organization outside of Washington, so it is fitting that Governor Knight and Mayor Poulson welcome the Americas through

Dr. Fernando Lobo, Chairman of the Organization of American States. The occasion will constitute another first for Los Angeles and one difficult to surpass in pleasure and importance.

Welcome, American neighbors.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to participate in this celebration of the 67th anniversary of the Pan American Union, and pay my tribute to our neighbors to the South. For many years I have had a deep appreciation of the necessity for solidarity in the Western Hemisphere, the importance of friendly, neighborly relations between all of the 21 Republics. Except for a trip to Panama, however, I had never traveled through Latin America until a year ago. Then, as a delegate to the inauguration of President Kubitschek, I journeyed to Brazil, and on the same trip I visited Bolivia, Peru, Colombia and Guatemala. On that trip I realized the many things we all had in common, but I also realized the individual characteristics, cultures, and problems of each of those countries each of them great and important in their own way. I met fine people in each country, in all walks of life. I realized, as one always does from such visits, that countries are not merely places on a map; nations are not statistics, but people, with human powers and frailties, with infinite possibilities. So I greet this Pan-American Day with a new appreciation of Latin America and its culture, a new bond with the fine folks who live there.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we again welcome the opportunity to celebrate Pan-American Day—April 14. It may be well for us to pause and reflect upon its truly historical significance. For us in the New World it is a day peculiarly our own—the day of the Americas—when Americans both to the north and south can join hands to bring about a better understanding of one another, and cement hemispheric solidarity.

Let us therefore briefly review the progress which the Americas have made. It seems particularly desirable that we do so because next to world peace hemispheric unity is of the utmost importance to the people of the Americas.

In these anxious times when nations are wearily striving for an enduring peace in spite of overwhelming difficulties, the example of the Americas might well be taken as a guiding light for this troubled world.

Painfully, with measured steps, and in spite of many weaknesses and misunderstandings, the nations of the Americas have progressed along a weary road until now they clearly understand that while they are equal independent and sovereign nations, at the same time they are interdependent neighbors with similar problems. The crucible of the war brought them together to find victory through their united front.

As far back as 1810 the eminent Chilean Don Juan Egana made the first proposal for pan-American unity, foreseeing with statesmanlike outlook the importance of unity of purpose and policy of the American Republics.

Many important steps have been taken to increase the effectiveness of the inter-American system and of course one of the greatest of these was the founding of the Pan American Union 66 years ago today.

Another was when President Hoover, 26 years ago, proclaimed April 14, 1931, as Pan American Day.

From a series of inter-American conferences a better understanding was brought about and the keystone for closer ties of friendship was the machinery set up for prompt consultation on matters of common concern.

In 1940 at Habana it was recognized an aggression of the territory or sovereignty of any nation in the Americas should be considered as an aggression against all.

These policies led ultimately to the Act of Chapultepec at Mexico City where it was agreed not only acts of aggression from without should be the concern of all, but also acts of aggression from within the hemisphere against another American State.

The United Nations at San Francisco recognized the importance of such regional arrangements by approving of such agreements in its charter just as the signers of the Act of Chapultepec recognized the United Nations by agreeing its activities should be "consistent with the purposes and principles of the general international organization."

So today the Americas have adopted a charter of their own to keep the peace. The 3,000-mile unfortified border between Canada and the United States, the towering figure of the Christ of the Andes high on the border between Chile and Argentina take on a new and added significance.

As I have indicated there have been many factors which have tended to bring about hemispheric security and to consolidate the ties of understanding and confraternity.

Among these is the fact that the Americas of all the areas of the world are best suited for geographical unity. Without the racial and historic prejudices of the Old World, they comprise an area equal to 25 percent of the globe—consisting of 12 million square miles of the richest and most diversified resources of the world. Their climates and crops supplement each other which in and of itself draws the peoples of the hemisphere closer together and creates bonds of solidarity.

Just as we, in the years past, fought and died for our independence in the New World, so did the patriots of our neighbors to the south fight for the independence of their respective countries. This, too, provides a common bond of understanding as all these countries have heritages dedicated to the same ideals of independence of nations.

I need not add that in the fields of culture, music, art, and sciences there are great opportunities for progress because contacts of this character ignore national borders and local differences.

One of the best examples of the friendly feeling between ourselves and our American neighbors is that in the Americas alone of all the world there are

no quota restrictions on immigration to this country.

While I have recited many instances of progress which we in the Americas have made in the past it does little good to blink the fact that there are still many problems to be solved.

All too often, up to the present time, there have been entirely too many coups, revolutions, and internal troubles in many of the countries of this hemisphere. There has been serious penetrations of both Red fascism and Red communism with its usual exploitation of false hope for the improvement of social and economic conditions for the people. An outstanding example how this problem can be met was when Guatemala, through her own efforts, overthrew the communistic infiltrated government and set up a truly democratic government.

As I have said on previous occasions, the so-called good-neighbor policy is not dependent on any one administration for its execution. This policy is a continuing one and rests upon a much sounder foundation. It is the universal desire of the vast majority of our people, which transcends partisan considerations, to have hemispheric unity for the betterment of us all—not just for the present but as a permanent policy.

As has so well been said, let us improve the inter-American system and remember its interdependence is its foundation, cooperation is its keystone.

Let us recall the words of the great liberator, Simón Bolívar:

We, for our part, shall hasten with the most lively interest to establish the American compact, which forming all our republics into a single body politic, will present America to the world in an aspect of majesty and grandeur unexampled among the nations of antiquity. America thus united, if Heaven grant our desire, may be called the queen of nations and the mother of republics.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, pan-Americanism as a working concept dates back to the time of Simón Bolívar, the great liberator, who was the first to call a convention of the American nations. Bolívar's attempt, at the Congress of Panama in 1826, to establish a confederation to protect the hemisphere against outside attack did not bear immediate fruit, but the ideal of regional cooperation did not die.

As the threat of external attack declined, interest in commercial and economic development within the Western Hemisphere increased. It was in response to this interest that Secretary of State James G. Blaine called the First International Conference of American States to be held in Washington in 1890. It was the commercial bureau established at this meeting which eventually was developed into the Pan American Union.

The 1890 conference was only the first in what was to prove a long and successful series of hemispheric meetings. From the original emphasis on closer commercial relations the American States gradually moved on to deal with other broader problems. These included the establishment of machinery to settle inter-American disputes and to protect the Western Hemisphere. Eventually questions of international law, finance,

agriculture, transportation, communications, health, sanitation, education, and cultural affairs were added.

At the Ninth Conference of the American States, held at Bogotá in 1948, a new high point in pan-American cooperation was reached with the adoption of the Charter of the Organization of American States. Simón Bolívar's noble dream of over a century before was finally well on the way to becoming a reality.

Today the 347 million people of the 21 American Republics are bound together in a wide variety of cooperative endeavors. In addition to formal ties between the various countries there has been a tremendous growth in inter-American trade, student exchange, tourist travel, and general cultural interchange. This progress is taking concrete form in such projects as the nearly completed Pan American Highway and in the Interama Center planned for construction in Miami.

On this 67th observance of the pan-American movement it is appropriate that we not only mark the progress that has been made, but that we look forward to the many tasks yet remaining. The military security of the Western Hemisphere rests on a firm basis, but there is a great need for more private investment and continued Government technical assistance to help in the rapid economic growth of Latin America. This development is of tremendous importance to the United States as a whole, and to Florida in particular.

There is, however, always a danger that close neighbors may fall into the habit of taking each other's friendship for granted. On this occasion it may be well for us in the United States to make a special effort to guard against an attitude of indifference to our good neighbors to the south. The United States and Latin America are close not only geographically, but historically and sentimentally as well. This is to the advantage of both, and to continue this close working relationship in the future requires the interest, friendship, and cooperation of men of good will in both North and South America. It is to this task that we should look while observing Pan American Week.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it was inspiringly uplifting to hear Father Joseph F. Thorning, who has been called "the good padre of the Americas," in this morning's prayer and I understand today's message was his 13th in as many Pan American Days.

May we become increasingly conscious of the good works of our good friends and neighbors in the Western Hemisphere, and may we continually strive to convince them we are anxious to work with them side by side for freedom and peace.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PAYMENT TO COMMISSIONED OFFICERS FOR LOSSES INCURRED UNDER EMERGENCY ECONOMY LEGISLATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 293) to authorize settlement for certain inequitable losses in pay sustained by officers of the commissioned services under the emergency economy legislation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would first like to point out that the amount involved in the proposed legislation is not budgeted for in the fiscal 1957 or fiscal 1958 budgets for the Department of Defense. Secondly, I do want to point out that based on testimony given before the Committee on the Judiciary and based on statements submitted to me by those who are most interested in behalf of this legislation, this legislation, if approved, would potentially cost the Federal Treasury \$1,328,300. As the Members of this body know, the Consent Calendar committee on both sides of the aisle on February 19, 1957, submitted to the membership certain rules and regulations pertaining to the Consent Calendar. On page 2249 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 19, it indicates and I quote:

The members of the committee feel first that generally no legislation should pass by unanimous consent which involves an aggregate expenditure of more than \$1 million.

Consequently, based on the information which I have indicated, and based on the rules set forth by the Consent Calendar committee, I must object to the consideration of this legislation.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES BEFORE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 259) to prescribe a method by which the Houses of Congress and their committees may invoke the aid of the courts in compelling the testimony of witnesses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. THORNBERRY, SMITH of Virginia, and IKARD objected.

CLINT AND FABENS SCHOOL DISTRICTS, TEXAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1983) to provide for the conveyance of the reversionary interest of the United States in certain lands to the Clint Independent School District and the Fabens Independent School District in the State of Texas, or to either of them, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on the last call of the calendar this bill was put over at my request in view of the absence of a departmental report. Since that time a report from the Department has been furnished.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State is hereby authorized, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, to enter into an agreement with the board of trustees of the Clint Independent School District, Clint, Tex., and the board of trustees of the Fabens Independent School District, Fabens, Tex., municipal corporations of the State of Texas and grantees of an undivided one-half interest in and to a 40-acre tract of land covered by a deed dated May 14, 1940, filed of record in volume 667, at page 290 of the deed records of El Paso County, Tex., (1) consenting on behalf of the United States that the said municipal corporations may voluntarily partition between them the land so granted: *Provided*, That the reversionary provisions in said deed shall remain unaffected by such partition; and (2) providing for the exchange by either or both of said grantee municipal corporations in accord with the provisions of section 2 hereof of the lands so granted and so partitioned for other lands of not less than an equal area and value, as determined by the Secretary of State, as said municipal corporations, or either of them, may deem more suitable for public educational purposes.

SEC. 2. When the agreement contemplated by section 1 hereof shall have been concluded, there shall be exchanged simultaneously by the parties in interest such deeds and other instruments as may be required by the laws of the State of Texas (1) to effect a waiver by the Secretary of State on behalf of the Government of the United States of the reversionary interest which it has in the lands covered by the partition and to be exchanged; (2) to vest in the Government of the United States in the lands to be received in exchange by the said municipal corporations, or either of them, for their portions or portion of the lands to be partitioned a reversionary interest, which reversionary interest shall be of like intent and legal effect as the reversionary interest retained by the United States under the provisions in the said deed of May 14, 1940, to said municipal corporations; and (3) to effect the exchange between the present owners in fee simple of the lands covered by the partition and of those for which the exchange is to be made: *Provided, however*, That none of the instruments of title shall be valid until all necessary deeds and other instruments have been executed and exchanged: *And provided further*, That the exchange of lands herein contemplated shall be without cost to the United States.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of State is further authorized to execute on behalf of the Government of the United States such deeds and other instruments of title as shall be necessary to carry out the purpose of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOANS TO HOMESTEADERS AND DESERT-LAND ENTRYMEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3753) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to desert-land entrymen to the same extent as such assistance is available to homestead entrymen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. LANHAM objected.

PENSIONS FOR VETERANS SUFFERING FROM TUBERCULOSIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1264) to provide that certain veterans suffering from active pulmonary tuberculosis shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled for pension purposes while they are hospitalized.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LIMITING PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN BENEFICIARIES OF CERTAIN VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 72) to amend section 21 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, to provide for the disposition of certain benefits which are unpaid at the death of the intended beneficiary.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTEND AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1045) to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if I may have the attention of somebody from the Committee on Agriculture.

I do not question at all the merits of the conservation program. That is not dealt with in this bill, but if I understand correctly, this program since its inauguration in 1936 has been a program of Federal grants-in-aid to the States.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. And this bill would change that so that from here on it would be a direct Federal program. Am I correct in that?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No. The bill does not change the character of the program at all. The program every year has to run the Congressional gauntlet of an extension. That is an extension for 2 years ever since 1936. The bill is always carried on the Consent Calendar and has been passed by unanimous consent for a number of years. At the present time the Department has a budget problem which is rather serious. They have reason to believe that the program will be continued every 2 years, but they do

not actually know that. Nevertheless, they proceed with setting up their budget down there, but the time may come when they may run into a controversy about that. The Department is heartily in favor of the legislation, and it came from the committee by a unanimous report.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I understand there is no change made in the basic philosophy or the basic operation of the program. The only thing you do in this bill is to make it permanent rather than a temporary character.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is right. There is no change whatever in the basic philosophy of the bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g), is further amended as follows: Subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g), and the subsection designation "(a)" are stricken out.

Sec. 2. (a) Subsection (a) of section 8 of said act, as amended, relating to the period within which the Secretary is authorized to develop programs and make payments directly to farmers for specified purposes, is hereby repealed.

(b) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 8 of said act, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "Subject to the limitation provided in subsection (a) of this section, the" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "The."

(c) Subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 8 of said act, as amended, are redesignated as subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e), respectively.

Sec. 3. Sections 8, 9, and 12 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, are amended by deleting "7 (a)" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "7."

Sec. 4. Section 388 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by deleting "8 (b)" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "8 (a)."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g), is further amended by deleting subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(a) The Secretary shall exercise the powers conferred in this section to carry out the purposes specified in section 7 (a), in any year and in any State for which no State plan has been approved for such State pursuant to section 7: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary shall carry out the purposes specified in section 7 (a) through State action as rapidly as adequate State laws are enacted and satisfactory State plans are submitted. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section and section 7, the provisions of this section with respect to the State, county, and local committees of farmers shall continue in full force and effect for purposes other than the administration of State plans."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read: "A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEREMPTORY CHALLENGES IN CIVIL SUITS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3368) to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee exactly how this bill will operate.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. This was reported unanimously from the Committee on the Judiciary. The present operation of the peremptory challenge is limited to three on each side, with the proviso that the judge may, in his discretion, give additional peremptory challenges to the defendant.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Does the gentleman believe that this bill may put a burden upon Federal judges that is not now there, that will become embarrassing to the judiciary?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No; it will not. All it does is to equalize and give to the judge the right to extend to the defendant as well as the plaintiff additional peremptory challenges.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Would this bill be an opening wedge to extending the same privilege in criminal cases?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No. This has nothing to do with criminal cases.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Has there been any hearing before your committee at any time about giving the same right to defendants in criminal cases? Frankly, that is what I am afraid of.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It has nothing to do with criminal cases. This is recommended by the Judicial Conference. The question, as it may relate to criminal proceedings, will be met when presented.

We feel that it would be disadvantageous to continue civil actions whereby you give to one party, that is, the defendants, in a civil action, the right to appeal to the judge to get extra peremptory challenges, but the same right is not granted to the plaintiff.

All this does is to equalize the number of challenges available to each side and say that whether you are plaintiff or defendant, if you can convince the judge of the necessity for extra challenges, he may grant them to both sides.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. I thank the gentleman. One further question: In case there should be a multitude of defendants, like several hundred in one case, it is entirely up to the judge whether or not he grants the right of additional peremptory challenges.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1870. Challenges

"In civil cases, each party shall be entitled to three peremptory challenges. Several defendants or several plaintiffs may be considered as a single party for the purposes of making challenges, or the court may allow additional peremptory challenges and permit them to be exercised separately or jointly. "All challenges for cause or favor, whether to the array or panel or to individual jurors, shall be determined by the court."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

USE OF CERTIFIED MAIL IN SUMMONING JURORS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3367) to amend section 1867 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the use of certified mail in summoning jurors.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1867 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1867. Summoning jurors

"When the court orders a grand or petit jury to be drawn the clerk shall issue summons for the required number of jurors and deliver them to the marshal for service.

"Each person drawn for jury service may be served personally or by registered or certified mail addressed to such person at his usual residence or business address.

"Such service shall be made by the marshal who shall attach to his return the addressee's receipt for the registered or certified summons, where service is made by mail."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENDING APPLICATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 230) to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to personnel employed by the House Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the investigations ordered by House Resolution 104, 85th Congress.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do so to ask the gentleman from Louisiana or some gentleman from the Committee on the Judiciary a question. What I have in mind particularly is the extent to which the committee will have in mind conflict of interest. I ask this because of some experiences we had last year on certain tariff matters, and I am concerned about that particular issue.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As the gentleman knows, the law at the present time prohibits one with a conflict of interest to take employment with the

Government and keeps him from considering other employment after it is over. To the extent that the Ways and Means Committee anticipates the use of these employees is not certain. However, we feel that we should waive it in this special investigation.

Mr. SISK. I realize, I might say to the gentleman from Colorado, that they have certain problems with reference to securing experts, or people who are thoroughly familiar with tariff matters which are technical, but I am interested in a determination as to what the committee feels to be its responsibility in the case where a possible conflict of interest might arise under this provision.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I do not know what the Ways and Means Committee may have in mind in that regard, but it would be well for the committee in the exercise of its judgment not to bring in a party who has outside interests which would benefit from information he got through his work on the committee.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection and ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RELINQUISHMENT OF THE OFFICE OF CHIEF JUDGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 985) to provide that chief judges of circuit and district courts shall cease to serve as such upon reaching the age of 70.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that under this bill a judge who is 70 years of age, who may be of the greatest worth to the court, who has no physical impairment and whose brain, if anything, is keener than in his younger years, but merely because of years, would have to retire?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The answer to the gentleman's question is "No." The present statute requires the senior circuit judge and senior district judge to handle administrative work. This bill, if it is adopted, would require that a senior judge, on reaching the age of 75 years, will be relieved of his duties and responsibilities in the administrative field only. He will still continue to hold his office as a Federal judge. That is the only object and purpose of this legislation.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Then, as I understand the gentleman, the bill is in line with much that is being done now to measure persons not by their worth and their actual physical soundness and mental alertness, but the number of years they have lived. It presumes that when any man is 70 or 75 it is time to step out.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I do not like this kind of legislation. Compulsory retirement of educators, policemen, judges, and others is responsible for a waste we can ill afford. It is discrimination in its ugliest form. Every person should be judged by what he actually is, and not by the years of a calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I may say to the gentleman that we have a number of judges who have passed the age of 75 and who insist upon handling mere details of the administrative functions of the court, with the result it has impaired the efficiency of some of the district courts and some of the circuit courts. We provide a method that when he reaches the age of 75 he will not be burdened with this responsibility. We provide that the judge who will succeed him must have had at least 1 year's experience as a judge in the district or circuit.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. You get rid of him kindly. You do not shoot him, you just chloroform him.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No, we do not shoot him. We just say: You do not have to do as much work. If you want to, you can continue and decide a few more cases and not devote your whole time and interest to administrative details with reference to which clerk and which case shall be assigned to whom. If he is 75 or 85 and wants to continue he may do so under this bill. It would just relieve him of a lot of petty details.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think there may be a little confusion. The bill itself refers to the age 70.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. With the committee amendments I think it should be pointed out they raise the age to 75. It does not go into effect at 70 but at 75.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think this is the sort of legislation that should not be on the Consent Calendar so I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTRA LONG STAPLE COTTON PRICE SUPPORT LEVEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3654) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to price support for extra long staple cotton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 812) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to price support for extra long staple cotton, and to substitute the Senate bill, which is a similar bill, for H. R. 3654.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 101 (f) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"The provisions of this act relating to price support for cotton shall apply severally to (1) American upland cotton and (2) extra long staple cotton described in subsection (a) and ginned as required by subsection (e) of section 347 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, except that, notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions

of section 101 of this act, the level of support to cooperators for the 1957 and each subsequent crop of extra long staple cotton, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas therefor, shall be the same per centum of the parity price as for the 1956 crop."

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3654) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMANDING GENERAL OF THE MILITIA OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO HOLD THE RANK OF MAJOR GENERAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4144) to provide that the commanding general of the militia of the District of Columbia shall hold the rank of major general.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the organization of the militia of the District of Columbia," approved March 1, 1889 (D. C. Code, sec. 39-201), is amended by striking out "brigadier general" and inserting in lieu thereof "major general."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, delete all of lines 6 and 7 and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "amended by inserting after 'brigadier general' the words 'or major general'."

On page 1, after line 7, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 2. The act entitled 'An act to authorize the detail of an officer of the retired list of the Army as adjutant-general of the District of Columbia militia,' approved June 6, 1900 (D. C. Code, sec. 39-205), is amended by striking out 'brigadier-general commanding' and inserting in lieu thereof 'commanding general of.'"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide that the commanding general of the militia of the District of Columbia shall hold the rank of brigadier general, or major general."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING RETIRED ANNUITIES OF MEMBERS OF THE TEACHING STAFFS OF THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY AND THE UNITED STATES NAVAL POST GRADUATE SCHOOL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5832) to increase the retired annuities of the civilian members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the annuities, payable under chapter 607 of title 10, United States Code, to civilian members of the teaching staff of the United States Naval Academy

or of the United States Naval Postgraduate School are increased as follows: That portion of an annuity which is not in excess of \$1,500 is increased by 12 percent, and that portion of an annuity which is in excess of \$1,500 is increased by 8 percent. These increases shall not exceed the sum necessary to increase the annuity to \$4,104, and are in addition to the increases authorized by Public Law 371, 84th Congress. The monthly installments of each annuity shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.

Sec. 2. The increases provided by section 1, when added to the annuities of retired civilian members of the teaching staff of the United States Naval Academy or the United States Naval Postgraduate School, do not increase the annuities of their survivors. The annuity of any such survivor, however, who is entitled to or becomes entitled to an annuity under chapter 607 of title 10, United States Code, shall be increased in accordance with the following schedule:

If annuity commences between—	Portion of annuity not in excess of \$1,500 shall be increased by—	Portion of annuity in excess of \$1,500 shall be increased by—
January 16, 1936, and June 30, 1955.	12 per centum	8 per centum
July 1, 1955, and December 31, 1955.	10 per centum	7 per centum
January 1, 1956, and June 30, 1956.	8 per centum	6 per centum
July 1, 1956, and December 31, 1956.	6 per centum	4 per centum
January 1, 1957, and June 30, 1957.	4 per centum	2 per centum
July 1, 1957, and December 31, 1957.	2 per centum	1 per centum

SEC. 3. Any provision of law, enacted after the effective date of this act, which increases the annuities of retired employees and their survivors who are entitled to annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended (5 U. S. C. 691 et seq.), shall be applicable in like manner and to the same extent to civilian members of the teaching staff of the United States Naval Academy and of the United States Postgraduate School and their survivors who are entitled to annuities under chapter 607 of title 10, United States Code.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, line 1, after the words "United States" add the word "Naval."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 61]

Adair	Barden	Clark
Addonizio	Barrett	Colmer
Albert	Bass, N. H.	Cooley
Alger	Becker	Coudert
Anderson,	Belcher	Davis, Ga.
Mont.	Blitch	Delaney
Andrews	Bowler	Dellay
Anfuso	Boykin	Dempsey
Ashley	Buckley	Dies
Aspinall	Cederberg	Dixon
Ayres	Celler	Dollinger
Bailey	Chudoff	Donohue

Dorn, N. Y.	Keogh	Riehlman
Doyle	Knox	Rivers
Dwyer	Krueger	Rodino
Eberhart	Laird	Rogers, Mass.
Engle	Landrum	Roosevelt
Fallon	Lankford	Sadlak
Farbstein	Lennon	Santangelo
Fino	Loser	St. George
Flynt	McCulloch	Saund
Forrester	McDonough	Scherer
Friedel	McGovern	Scott, Pa.
Fulton	Magnuson	Shelley
Garmatz	Martin	Smith, Calif.
Gordon	May	Smith, Kans.
Granahan	Miller, Calif.	Springer
Green, Pa.	Miller, Md.	Taylor
Gregory	Miller, Nebr.	Teague, Calif.
Gubser	Miller, N. Y.	Teague, Tex.
Halleck	Morano	Teller
Harvey	Morris	Thomas
Healey	Morrison	Thompson, La.
Hill	Multer	Tollefson
Hillings	Norblad	Utt
Holtzman	Norrell	Vinson
Horan	O'Brien, N. Y.	Walter
Hyde	O'Neill	Westland
Jackson	Osmer	Widnall
Jarman	Patterson	Willis
Jennings	Philbin	Wolverton
Judd	Powell	Yates
Kearney	Radwan	Zelenko
Keating	Rains	
Kelly, N. Y.	Reece, Tenn.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 299 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SECOND URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6870) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 4 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if we could not get along with 1 hour or 1½ hours at the most.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I think the people of the country want to know something about this. I think everybody is very much interested. I want to give an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to everybody who wants to whitewash the Postmaster General to have time to do so.

Mr. TABER. Suppose we try to limit debate to 2 hours? How about 2 hours?

Mr. CANNON. I will agree to 3 hours, then.

Mr. TABER. That is a little better. I will go along with that. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent then that general debate be limited to 3 hours, half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 6870, with Mr. SMITH of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 1 hour and 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 1 hour and 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized now.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us deals with a number of routine deficiencies and supplementals which are admissible under the antideficiency law. They are largely formal, and I shall not discuss them, as they are fully explained in the pending report of the committee.

However, there is an item in the chapter on Treasury and Post Offices which is not admissible under the antideficiency law.

Last Friday the Postmaster General arbitrarily, and in contravention of the duties imposed upon him by his office, abruptly discontinued a number of services customarily provided by the Department.

As a result we have had an opportunity to observe the effects of the extraordinary measures to which he has resorted in his determination to dictate to the Congress and the American people and take as much money as he wants from the United States Treasury to be spent as and when he wishes.

Under the Constitution no money can be appropriated except by act of Congress. The taxpayers acting through their representatives control the purse strings. But the Postmaster General changes all that and the taxpayers instead of the taxpayers take over the purse strings.

Congress appropriated enough money—over \$3 billion—to run the Department post offices for a year. They gave the Postmaster General more than he asked. But instead of making it last a year he spent it on extravagant programs during the first 9 months and now at the last minute comes in and tells Congress that unless he can have \$47 million more he will close the Department or discontinue services he is required by his official duties to provide.

He gave Congress no warning that he was running behind. The first intimation that he was overspending came the last month of the third quarter when he suddenly submits an estimate and demands immediate action by the House. The communication was referred by the Speaker to the committee which held hearings at the earliest possible minute. The subcommittee promptly notified the Postmaster General that it would allow \$17 million additional for items which were not in violation of the antideficiency act. And when the whole committee met the amount was increased to \$41 million to include items in contravention of the

Antideficiency Act. This gave him for operations alone \$2,166,000,000 when originally he had only asked for \$2,118,000,000.

Although adoption of the report for \$41 million by the committee was assurance that the money would be forthcoming as soon as it could reach the Senate and the President, he refused to withdraw his order for curtailment of service, which became effective at midnight Friday night.

There was no reason for this drastic act, unprecedented in American history, unless to cover up waste and extravagance and inefficiency in administration.

He said he had been advised by his lawyers that he would be subject to a year's imprisonment if he continued to spend money before he had it. There is no such law. But he refused to resume service, even after the allowance by the committee of \$41 million in addition to his first annual appropriation, until both Houses had passed the bill and it had been signed by the President and he had the money in his hand.

He still had left close to half a billion dollars of his first appropriation. Most of the personnel of the Department are paid by the month. They drew their pay whether they worked or not. Many of them sat all day behind closed windows when they could have been discharging their usual duties and keeping the mail service in operation. So any disadvantage or inconvenience which anyone may have suffered was due exclusively to the determination of the Postmaster to show Congress who was boss—the taxpayers or the taxeaters.

No one can now deny that the Postmaster General knew all along that he was overspending and his continued support of extravagant programs was every month making a deficiency imperative and inescapable. His continued application to the Bureau of the Budget for a deficiency estimate is proof positive of that.

The Postmaster's violation has been deliberate. He knew last July that he did not have enough money to go through the year at the rate at which he wanted to operate.

He could have cut down a slight amount at that time, spread the reduction over the entire year, and would have come out within the money given him. But he did not want to do it that way. He was determined to set the pace and rate of spending and purpose of spending, and not Congress. He deliberately planned his operations to thwart Congress and the taxpayers. He refused to plan his operations to live within the amount Congress had given him.

Many years ago Jay Gould, a plunderer who dealt in sums infinitesimal in comparison with those juggled by the Postmaster General, when warned of losses inflicted on the public, coined that famous phrase "The public be damned." In urging the Director of the Budget to violate the law and in refusing to carry out the provisions by Congress, the Postmaster General, in the language of the Comptroller, repeatedly violated both "the spirit and purpose of the law." It was another case of the public be damned.

But there can always be found some partisan to take the side of the down-trodden Postmaster General. You doubtless noted in this morning's newspaper that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] attempted to excuse him by saying that the committee "deliberately delayed action in providing the money." Unfortunately the record does not bear out that surmise.

The Postmaster General early applied to the Bureau of the Budget for deficiency estimates. Time and again he urged the Director of the Budget to bail him out. Each time he was denied and told that he must live within the amount given him by Congress. Finally the Director yielded to his importunities and sent a deficiency estimate to the House.

This was the first official notice given Congress. The Speaker referred the estimate to the committee, and an immediate hearing was ordered. The Postmaster General asked for a delay of a week, which was granted. From that time on every effort was made to accelerate the proceedings. There is no ground whatever for the statement which the gentleman from Maine has sent back to his district.

In the same vein, the newspapers this morning report that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] has released the statement to the press that Congress deliberately neglected to provide money for the purpose. As a matter of fact, for more than 8 months he did not come to Congress. The road was open to the President to come to Congress with a supplemental budget. But he did not come to Congress until March 12. The Postmaster General did not want to come to Congress. Congress would call him on the carpet and ask him embarrassing questions. Congress would tell him to allocate his spending and carry out his original plan, under which they had given him more than he asked. He preferred to wait until it was too late to reapportion, and then he would bludgeon Congress with the necessity of providing money to keep the Department operating. And that was what he did. This was the first official notice given Congress, and promptly a hearing was called and every action taken to expedite consideration. The hearing was ordered, but the Postmaster General himself asked for a delay of a week.

Still here is a charge that we deliberately delayed giving the money. That is just not so. The statement is not justified by the facts. The Postmaster General went ahead in deliberate violation of the spirit and purpose of the law. He failed to secure a deficiency estimate; he failed to convince the President's Office of the alleged need for additional funds until March 12.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I was wondering why the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations did not call a meeting of the full committee earlier last week? That is what I felt was the deliberate delay. If he had called a meeting earlier, we could have had the same discussion we are having today earlier and

we would have gotten the money appropriated so that the post offices would not have had to close over the weekend.

Mr. CANNON. A meeting was called at the earliest moment, as is customary under our procedure. Friday is the customary day for the meeting of the whole committee. Time is required in which to prepare hearings and reports for consideration by the whole committee. The clerks of the committee must have an opportunity to check, the subcommittee must have an opportunity to secure the facts, and at the very next Friday we called a meeting of the committee.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, there can be no misunderstanding of the facts here. They are fully set out in the report. We gave the Postmaster General ample funds last year. We gave him more than he asked. And he abrogates the antideficiency law, a law which it took us years to perfect; the most salutary provision in our budgetary system.

There are two fundamental questions involved here. The first is, Shall the dog wag the tail or the tail wag the dog? Shall Congress control the departments or shall the departments control Congress? Shall Congress retain its constitutional right to take money out of the Treasury or shall Congress delegate that to the departments? That is the first question.

The next question is, Shall the Government continue to take an unconscionable cut out of every man's income, out of his wages, out of his salary, out of the money upon which his family must depend? Shall it continue to levy wartime taxes in time of peace? Or shall we reduce expenses sufficiently to permit Congress to cut taxes at this session?

These are the two questions before us here this afternoon. All this hullabaloo about the Postmaster General is merely incidental. The people back home are not so much interested in Mr. Postmaster General as has been demonstrated in the last 2 days. But they are interested in what it costs them to live and support their families. They are interested in the amount of taxes you are taking away from them. And they think it is high time you took this heavy burden off their backs and permitted them to spend their own money instead of the Government letting the Postmaster General spend it contrary to law.

And, of course, there is only one way to reduce taxes and that is to reduce expenses. As long as you continue to increase expenses—and this time the Bureau of the Budget and the President asked for the Post Office Department more money than it ever had before, and now come back for \$47 million more—as long as every Department asks more money, and the President recommends more money, the only way to get that money is to take it out of the pockets of the taxpayers. There is no other source.

We hope to cut taxes this session. The House leadership has already announced a tax-reduction program for this session, now, when the people want it, when they ought to have it, when they need it. We are going to release this brake on the national economy.

But that is dependent upon one thing: It is dependent upon our cutting out of this \$71.8 billion budget, this highest of all peacetime budgets, enough money to warrant a tax-reduction bill.

Most of us came here after hard-fought campaigns. In every district there are 20 or 30 men back home that would like to have your job. They would run against you if they thought they had a chance to win. The only reason they do not run is because they do not think they have a chance to win. There is no better way to encourage them than to keep on throwing money around to the departments—letting the departments write their own tickets. And then grinding the taxpayers down to get the money to pay the bills.

We have only a few more bills and a few more weeks to wait to find out whether we have cut enough from the budget to support a tax bill. Unless we do there is no chance for tax relief now or next year or any other year.

The amount generally indicated by the experts who pass on the matter, is \$4 billion. They estimate, say we will have to cut \$4 billion out of this budget to justify a tax cut. In round figures the budget by the end of the session will aggregate \$72 billion, and we will have to cut it down to at least \$68 billion to warrant a tax cut. Up to this time we have cut nearly one and one-quarter billion dollars, and we have done it by piecemeal. Every time we have brought in an amendment to cut a little off an appropriation there has been a storm of protest saying that is peanuts, it is chicken-feed, what is the use of cutting small amounts like that? But many a mickle makes a muckle—we have now cut about \$1.25 billion. But we must have \$2.75 billion more.

And we will have to quit bringing in these deficiency bills. What is the use of cutting a little money here and there and then bringing in a deficiency bill like this, and throwing it all out the back door? In the bill before you, you are undoing part of what you accomplished when you made these piecemeal cuts which gave you this start of \$1.25 billion on our slow but sure way to tax reduction.

The stock market has been on a steady downward trend. Eight to ten percent of industrial securities on the exchange have lost a total of \$18 billion in the last 18 months. So the outlook for continued increased income, increased prosperity, is not so good. We run in cycles. These money trees do not bloom forever. We are on the downward swing of the cycle. We cannot depend on record-breaking revenues indefinitely.

And the burden of taxation is rapidly reaching the maximum of human endurance.

The purchasing power of the average factory worker is lower than it was a year earlier. It is significant that this is the first time that has happened during the Eisenhower administration.

Taxes—State, Federal, and local taxes—take about 1 dollar out of every 3 the average man makes.

A man today in standard industry is really working 2 hours and 45 minutes out of every 8-hour day for the Government. Out of every 8-hour day he has

to work 2 hours and 45 minutes to pay his taxes before he begins to make anything to support his family. That leaves about 5 hours and 15 minutes a day to provide food, housing, clothing, and everything else the family requires. In other words, over one-third of every day we are working for the Government. High taxes intensify inflation, hike the cost of living higher, and cut the buying power of the pay of the daily wage worker lower.

We have some chance to say what shall be spent locally for schools in our town, county, and community centers, but nationally we have let control of expenditure get away from us as in this bill.

Britain is in dire distress—yet they are reducing taxes.

Our situation, our responsibility, in the world is growing. Britain and France and other NATO countries are pulling out; they are withdrawing; they are taking their troops home; they are throwing the burden on us. We will need financial stability and solvency, as never before. How shall we maintain it when every year this budget swells, until this year we have the largest peacetime budget in history?

Too much cannot be said for the faithful, efficient, hard-working personnel of the Post Office Department. All through the country in every post office you find men ready and able and willing, doing their work, filling their jobs, and carrying on. But they need leadership. Where there is no leadership, the people perish.

And there is another phrase in that quotation that is apropos at this time. "But he that keepeth the law, happy is he."

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the Director of the Budget and the Postmaster General will read that famous, that wonderful statement justified by the centuries from the pen of the wisest of all men, King Solomon. It was true in his day, it is true in our day.

The Post Office Department is one of the biggest businesses in the world. It is a monopoly. It controls the market completely. No competitor can interfere. Yet this enormous business with an absolute monopoly cannot keep its ledgers in the black. They need business efficiency.

Mr. Chairman, here is an editorial from this morning's Wall Street Journal.

The Wall Street Journal is perhaps the widest read financial journal in the world. It supported President Eisenhower in 1952 and in 1956. It heartily approved Br. Brundage as Director of the Budget, and it was in complete agreement with the appointment of Mr. Summerfield as Postmaster General. So I have seldom found myself in agreement with its editorial policies. But this morning its leading editorial indicates one of the most profound reversals in the history of American journalism.

Also, in this connection I include a telegram just handed to me as I came in. It is from an organization of businessmen in Baltimore:

BALTIMORE, Md., April 15, 1957.

All right, so the post office did not operate Saturday. But nobody was seriously hurt.

Now let's stick to our guns and see that Postmaster General Summerfield operates the Department within the budget. Economy must be enforced.

And here is what the Wall Street Journal had to say:

So, Postmaster General Summerfield has informed Congress that if it does not promptly give him the money he wants for the Post Office, he will take a meat ax to the postal service.

Now, you know, that term "meat ax" strikes a responsive chord in memory. We have heard that word "Meat ax" before. The meat ax is going to cut appropriations; going to insist on economy; going to enforce the Antideficiency Act. My good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] over there, known as the great meat ax expert, comes in today like Mary's little lamb, following behind the Postmaster General. No meat ax at all. Just an affectionate little sheep. And, may I add that when he was chairman of the committee and we had before us a Postmaster General who had not spent money but merely proposed spending money, that I supported him and supported the committee against my own Postmaster General. There was no politics in it then. We have something more important than politics in this. I voted with the gentleman from New York. I supported him. I supported my chairman in his criticism of my Postmaster General, in his insistence that the Postmaster General should obey the anti-deficiency law. But, when the shoe is on the other foot, that is a different matter, and no matter how much money they waste he is entirely satisfied with the way things are going down there in the Post Office Department when nobody else is satisfied.

But here is the editorial. It is from New York, too:

The "general's" ultimatum was handed to the Congressmen a week ago, and when they didn't fall all over themselves in a rush to put up the money, he got out the cleaver. In New York and many other cities the post office windows were shuttered on Saturday and there were no mail deliveries. Further cutbacks in service are scheduled for this morning. The general's operation plan calls for cutting daily mail deliveries to business today. If that doesn't speed up Congress, he will suspend money-order sales at first and second-class post offices on April 29.

And that is another thing which a great many telegrams mentioned this morning, that they do not need any Federal money orders; the banks can operate quicker and cheaper.

Now none of this, you understand, has anything to do with the regular Post Office appropriation.

And that is something we should not lose sight of.

Congress appropriated the 1957 money last year; the 1958 appropriation is not due until next June 30. This is extra money—known technically as a deficiency appropriation—that Mr. Summerfield is asking to tide him over until next June 30.

And he says, "Gimme quick, or else." And you can supply the remainder.

If this strikes you as pretty arrogant behavior from a public servant—a sort of blackmail of the body politic—Mr. Summerfield's defense is that he can't help it. He

has just plain run out of money. And how can he be expected to run the Post Office, or anything else, without money?

The trouble with this reply is that it raises as many questions as it answers.

It is certainly not amiss to inquire why this emergency came so suddenly. Mr. Summerfield knew last summer how much money he had to run the Post Office for a full 12 months. Dividing a given sum of money by 12 doesn't require advanced mathematics. If it is true, as alleged, that the money provided last summer was too penurious to keep service up to par for the full year, one still wonders why small adjustments were not made during the year.

It might be said, also, that one still wonders why he did not come to Congress about it—why the President himself did not see fit to send up a supplemental budget. Mr. Summerfield works under the direction of the President.

No sensible post-office clerk, however unhappily underpaid, would unconcernedly spend his year's salary in less than a year.

The difference may well be that a post-office clerk is not habituated to deficiency appropriations. With Government departments they were, at one time, so usual as to seem an almost unquestioned right—

That is why we have that antideficiency law. That is why we put teeth in it in 1950—

and Mr. Summerfield may be honestly surprised to find himself now out of money and none promptly provided. It's a temptation to forego frugality in November when the Appropriations Committees will be in session in April.

To suppose that this sudden crisis was deliberately developed for its dramatic effect on Congress may be very unfair. It could be that the Post Office Department was simply lulled into not counting its pennies carefully. But if this is not a calculated kind of political blackmail—

The staid and conservative Wall Street Journal says this—

But if this is not a calculated kind of political blackmail, then somebody in Congress ought to find out who goofed.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has reported a bill, H. R. 6870 by Mr. CANNON from the House Committee on Appropriations. Is he asking the House to support this proposed legislation or is he asking the House to vote against it?

Mr. CANNON. I am asking the House to take into consideration the facts. They are before us here. You should govern yourself accordingly.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But does the gentleman want us to vote against the whole thing?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman may do as he pleases. I will not vote for it. I will not vote to abdicate the right of the Congress to control national finances. I will not condone violation of law. I will not vote to increase expenses and make it impossible to lower taxes. I will not vote to discard the antideficiency law after JOHN TABER and I and more than a hundred members of the Committee on Appropriations have worked for years to perfect it to the point where it will protect the United States Treasury.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I remember so well one of the great perorations of the gentleman from Missouri, the distinguished Chairman of our Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] about 1 year ago. We were then discussing the appropriation bill having to do with funds for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] had proposed an amendment having to do with the National Institutes of Health, raising the figure requested by the President and the Bureau of the Budget. The gentleman of Missouri came into the well of the House and he indulged in this peroration at the close of his speech.

"Why," he said, "Mr. Chairman, I cannot be for cancer. I have got to be for free beer. I must support the amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island."

And he did, upping the figure requested by the President and the Bureau of the Budget.

I am not high enough up in this world to be a regular subscriber for the Wall Street Journal, but I believe and I believe most sincerely that the House today will discharge its responsibility to the postal patrons of the United States and to the postal workers of our country. And I cannot help but believe that the Congress as a whole will send this bill to the President not later than tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, the New York Times has rendered a real service in reporting today a survey of postal services in foreign countries—on both sides of the Iron Curtain. It contends that such services are generally far superior to ours and usually pay their own way.

Slight losses in the British postal system last year were offset by profits on its telephone and telegraph services and currently up to four deliveries are made daily in London on business days and all urban areas get two deliveries a day.

France has also a splendid record and raises its rates when necessary to balance the postal budget. Paris has 4 deliveries a day, 6 days a week.

In West Germany, the postal system operates at a profit and there are two deliveries a day, Monday through Saturday.

Italy generally breaks about even and the larger cities have 3 deliveries 6 days a week, villages having 2.

Spain also reports a profit in its postal system, its larger cities having from 2 to 4 deliveries on workdays plus 1 on Sundays and holidays. Its system operates at a profit.

Seven-day-a-week deliveries are also the rule in Japan and in the large cities there are three deliveries on weekdays. Japan's postal system has run at a profit for the last 5 years because of expanded business and postage rises.

In Moscow, the Russians get four deliveries every day of the week. A first-class letter costs 10 cents and an air-mail letter 25 cents in our money.

Motor scooters help expedite Pakistan's deliveries every day except Sunday.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. May I ask the gentleman if he would be in favor of paying the postal employees the same amount that is being paid the postal employees in those countries? If we were to do that in America, I am absolutely certain we would make a profit on our postal service, but I am not in favor of eliminating the deficit in that manner.

Mr. CANFIELD. Let me say to my friend from Virginia that the domestic letter rate today in Germany is 4.8 cents, in France it is 4.3 cents, in Belgium it is 4 cents, in Norway it is 4.2 cents, in Switzerland it is 4.6 cents, and in Sweden it is 4.6 cents. The average is 4.4 cents, while we still use the 3-cent letter rate.

I do not have to repeat to you now the platforms adopted by the Republican and Democratic Parties last summer. Both of them stressed more expeditious and more efficient employment of our mail services. If anything, the Democratic platform was stronger than the Republican platform, because the Democratic platform emphasized more frequent delivery of our mail.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. What about the 1952 platform of the Republican Party, which specifically promised the return of the two deliveries a day?

Mr. CANFIELD. I do not recall that, but may I say to my friend from Massachusetts that I am still for the two deliveries a day. As the gentleman knows, our committee voted preponderantly to do away with that several years ago, and it has been done away with. I am sure the gentleman knows that.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is of course in a much better position to make the statement he has made than a lot of his colleagues on his side, because the gentleman is very independent minded.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. When did we do away with two deliveries a day, under what Postmaster General?

Mr. CANFIELD. I believe they were done away with in the year 1950. The abolition of the two-a-day system was projected by our subcommittee and that suggestion was promptly accommodated by the then Postmaster General, Mr. Donaldson. I strongly dissented.

Mr. JONAS. Is it not true that the then Postmaster General told the committee if he did not get certain moneys he would eliminate one of the deliveries a day, and that followed?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. No, he did not tell the committee that. The committee cut his request \$47 million and suggested that one way he could make up the \$47 million was by eliminating one mail delivery

a day in residential sections. He did so and saved \$100 million a year. The present Postmaster General estimates that to reinstate that one delivery daily would cost \$150 million a year, and I, for one, do not think it is worth it.

Mr. CANFIELD. I believe the gentleman from Virginia will recall that the facts are these. The Department was cut some \$26 million by the committee and \$22 million by the Bureau of the Budget and following the suggestion of our subcommittee, he issued the order doing away with the two deliveries a day.

Mr. GARY. I meant that his estimate was cut \$47 million.

Mr. CANFIELD. I recognize that. Today, Mr. Chairman, the Post Office Department of the United States loses money on practically every piece of mail it delivers excepting, that is, packages, and it is required to operate on 1957 costs with 1932 rates. It is important to bear in mind the Department spends most of the money it gets for personnel. Seventy-seven cents of every dollar goes to its employees and 16 cents for transportation and the other 7 cents for other expenses such as rent and so on.

It is clear, therefore, that most of the Department's expenses are completely out of its control.

Since 1945, the last surplus year, the Department reports its increases in wages, transportation, supplies, and other costs have amounted to \$1,860,000,000. About \$1,300,000,000 of this is attributed to wage and fringe benefit legislation approved by the Congress itself. During this period, Congress raised postal rates on two occasions to provide less than \$275 million in additional revenue. The demands for new service have bolstered the deficit, which nevertheless is expected next year to at least remain below the peak low of \$720 million set in 1952.

Mr. Chairman, the relationship between the Post Office Department and the Treasury and Post Office Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House have been extremely harmonious over the years. The record of the hearings contained repeated statements by committee members—by our chairman—by all committee members in respective of party—complimenting the Postmaster General and the members of his staff for their accomplishments in modernizing the postal establishment and improving the mail service.

Frankly, I cannot help but resent the statements made today by the distinguished chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], inferring that the Postmaster General believes in and indulges in a public-damned philosophy. You can read the hearings. Every page of the hearings conducted by our subcommittee these last 4 years—and until March 26, 1957, you will not be able to find one word derogatory of the character, the approach, and the dedication of the Postmaster General of our United States. We have gotten along with him very well indeed.

The Senate committee handling the Post Office request for supplemental funds knew last July that the Bureau of the Budget would come before the Con-

gress requesting a supplemental appropriation for the Post Office Department sometime later in the year. It was suggested on the other side of Capitol Hill that the Post Office Department wait until this year, the last half of the fiscal year 1957, to press for this supplemental.

On January 15 of this year, in a hearing before the House Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office appropriations, the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] asked the direct question as to the amount of the supplemental appropriation which the Department needed for the balance of the year. He was told this would total \$53 million, which included \$6 million for capital improvements. The Bureau of the Budget agreed to delete \$6 million for capital improvements on three of the largest post offices in our country, those in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. And now those funds are needed today to modernize those offices. Those offices have to do with the gateway cities of our country, servicing some 27 percent of our mail. It is extremely unfortunate that the Post Office Department was forced into this straitjacket situation, for it cannot spend money until it is actually in hand. The losers in a difficult situation, such as we are now experiencing, as the chairman of the committee pointed out, besides the postal patrons of our country are 520,000 faithful postal workers. The Congress should, I am certain, take positive action to appropriate the funds needed to resume normal mail service until June 30.

The Congress furthermore faces a similar situation which should be resolved promptly as regards the funds needed by the Post Office Department for its operations during the 1958 fiscal year starting on July 1. The Department has already indicated they will need \$58 million more to continue normal mail service throughout the fiscal year 1958 than so far has been appropriated to it. If the Congress fails to grant these additional moneys, the Post Office Department once again will have to curtail the mail service to live within its budgetary appropriation. In a few months are we going over this same situation again?

The continual phenomenal growth of our country and the unprecedented prosperity of our economy are basic reasons why the Post Office Department needs more money to carry an increased volume of mail than it originally estimated 18 months ago.

No business in the world can increase its volume without increasing costs, and the Post Office Department is no exception to the rule. When the people of the country decide to send more mail than the Department estimates, the Department must deliver it. Under these circumstances commonsense indicates the Department should have a more flexible procedure than at present, to get the money for these inevitable added costs. This is particularly true since by law all receipts of the Post Office Department go directly to the Treasury Department.

In the fiscal year 1958 the Department estimates it will have to extend letter-carrier service to 5,000 new communities. Unless it has the money to do so, and a large part of the \$58 million additional it needs will go for this purpose, our postal system will go backward rather than forward. Certainly the Members of Congress should understand these facts and be prepared to appropriate the funds needed to give the American people the mail service they deserve, expect, and are willing to pay for.

Mr. Chairman, the Post Office Department must prepare its budget about 12 months ahead of the beginning of the fiscal year. Work is really begun 18 months ahead. Hearings are held about 6 months before the start of the fiscal year. In preparing these budgets all expenditure estimates have to be related to the estimated volume of mail to be carried. The final appropriation limits the amount to be spent and has no provision for change in spending authority as the conditions change.

If the country is prosperous and people send more mail and are building more homes and start more new businesses than the Department has estimated, the postal service nevertheless has no more money to spend. Any increase in its receipts goes to the Treasury.

On the other hand, if conditions should turn downward and mails should decrease and other factors turn out to be less than the Department estimated, Congress holds no strings to reduce the Department's spending power.

This clearly points up the need for a new look by Congress at the post office budget problem, with some changes in the law or the annual appropriation procedure. One way would be for each appropriation to provide flexibility by giving the Postmaster General the authority to spend an additional amount equal to the amount by which receipts for the year exceed the estimates. This provision could be policed by the Bureau of the Budget, with reports to the Congress from time to time.

Another way to do it is to put the post office on a true revolving fund basis. Under such a plan the Congress would appropriate only for the net deficit—which we would hope, with higher postage rates, would be very small. If the Postmaster General then had authority to spend all of his receipts, in addition to the appropriated deficit, the amount that he could spend would automatically adjust upward or downward as the receipts went upward or downward.

It is unfair to put the postal administration in the position which it has had to face this year. It would be even more unfair to perpetuate this unworkable situation for the future. Congress should act this year to determine the proper way to provide flexibility in post office budgets, so that postal services would not have to be curtailed to live within estimates made more than 12 months ahead of the beginning of the year.

Now I want to say a word about postal employment.

The highest fiscal year and figure for postal employment was 1952. On June

30 in that year the number of postal employees was 523,757.

On June 30, 1957, postal employment will be just about the same figure.

In the same time the volume of mail has increased by 18 percent, establishing the efficiency of our postal workers.

Now, supplemental appropriations are not a new thing in the Congress of the United States. In 1947 the Post Office Department received a supplemental appropriation from the Congress for operating funds of \$93 million. In 1948 it received \$173,700,000; 1949, \$140,800,000; in 1950, \$71,400,000; in 1951 \$29,400,000; in 1951 it received \$250,000.

In 1953 the Department returned to the Treasury of the United States a surplus of \$83,574,247. In 1954 the same Department returned to the Treasury \$109 million, in round figures, and in 1955, the same Department returned to the Treasury \$43 million.

In 1956 the Congress voted a supplemental appropriation of \$16 million plus \$150 million for the salaries of postal workers.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. TABER. I think, Mr. Chairman, that first of all perhaps I ought to give you my own position. I have not changed in the slightest degree my feelings on the antideficiency law.

The difference between me and my position and the gentleman from Missouri and his position is that I maintain it is the duty of the Congress to supply the funds that are necessary to operate the agencies of the Government, and that we cannot punish the patrons of the postal system and the employees of the Post Office Department by trying to get even with them for something they did not themselves do. That is the reason I am wholeheartedly supporting this appropriation for the Post Office Department.

This deficiency—and it is a deficiency—is the result of the enormous increase in the number of dwellings and dwelling units that have been completed in this country, running between 1 million and 1.6 million a year over the post-war years. That has resulted in the necessity of creating new carrier routes and in some places additional clerks to take care of the office work in these places. There has also been more or less a buildup because of the change in the method of living.

As to whether or not this item is needed, I call your attention just now to the situation with which we are confronted. In the third quarter of this fiscal year the expenditures were \$484,612,000. The amount left over from the year's appropriations is \$443,884,000, or practically \$444 million. There will be a couple more days in the last quarter down to the 30th of June than there were in previous quarters.

On top of that the Post Office Department will have to finance certain amounts of annual leave for post office employees. It has been the invariable custom of the Post Office establishment to take care of a certain percentage of

those annual leaves in the fourth quarter of the year, that is, in the spring and early summer. More of it comes in the following period, which runs from the 1st of July to close to the 1st of October. That is the situation.

There have been certain transfers in the Department from the transportation fund to the operational fund and they have to a certain extent reduced the amount of the deficiency.

As to what the situation is with reference to the antideficiency law, the Comptroller General has made a decision. He has written a letter dated the 12th of April, addressed to the Postmaster General. I have a copy of that letter. I would think that it would be desirable for the membership to read that. Frankly, I believe that the Postmaster General should operate his plant so as to come within his appropriations. If he cannot, he should come back to the Congress early for a deficiency. He actually did advise the Congress back in the early part of January that he was going to have a deficiency for this year, and the figure he gave at that time was \$53 million, which I understand is \$6 million above the amount of the budget estimate that was considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but it was that way because that \$6 million was for transportation and it was determined that they did not need that deficiency.

Now, it is clear from the Comptroller General's opinion that there was no violation of the antideficiency law which is punishable in any way under the law. Perhaps the law requires revision, but this is the situation that we are actually confronted with, and this is the situation that we must face as we come to pass upon this bill. In other words, we should provide for what are the needs of the Department to give the kind of service that the people of the United States feel should be provided to the public, and pay for the services of the employees of the Post Office Department, and I think we should do this with just as little inconvenience in the operation of the situation as it is possible to have.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. Is the gentleman—and I am stating this for summary emphasis—making the argument that at this time and under the consideration of this measure the point is not how the deficiency occurred, but the point is who is going to be hurt if we do not pass this additional appropriation, namely, that it is going to be the users of the mail and the patrons of the mail that will be punished rather than any individual that might or might not have caused the trouble.

Mr. TABER. That is exactly correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that there will be a very great loss to the business of the country if this service is not continued; that in dollars and cents the Government will lose a great deal of money? Is that not correct?

Mr. TABER. I do not know how much, but I know it will create a good many bad situations. For instance, I think we are going to begin to hear from our farmer friends on rural free delivery routes who will not get their Saturday morning papers if this situation is not corrected. And I do not see how the Postmaster General can proceed, with the charges that have been bandied about, to open up the services that have been curtailed until he receives the money to do it with. If we are going to have respect for the things that the committee has complained about, I do not see how that can be had unless that course is followed. Now, that is my position. That is how I feel.

There is no question in my mind but what the items of service that are involved here are, practically all of them, things that should be given to the public. There might be some way to discontinue some work. But most of the things we would discontinue to bring about a reduction in operating expenses that would be required to bring the Post Office Department within the amount of money, \$443 million that is available for the quarter, are things that you cannot very satisfactorily explain to the people.

I am in hopes that this Congress will today go through the bill and pass it, so that it may go over to the other body and so that the other body may act on it, and so that it will remain as it has been presented to the members of the Committee of the Whole here rather than with any amendments that might delay its final passage. The bill relates only to a few deficiency items. It is not a long bill. I do not believe there is anything in it that would need to be changed very substantially.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I wonder if the gentleman would enlighten the House on a matter of procedure? It is my understanding that much of the criticism directed against the Postmaster General has been to the point that he borrowed in one quarter against a succeeding quarter; is that correct?

Mr. TABER. I think there is criticism of him for that. Of course, he did not violate the law himself. If the law was violated, according to the Comptroller General, it was violated by the Budget.

Mr. JOHANSEN. My question goes to this point. If the Postmaster General determines in the middle of a given quarter that the funds allocated for that quarter are not going to be adequate, what is the proper procedure for the Postmaster General in order to meet all possible criticism from whatever source and of whatever character to avoid borrowing against a future quarter?

Mr. TABER. I never heard of anybody who did anything who did not get some criticism. My own opinion is that the Postmaster General, in his approach to the problem, has been very careful to do the things that were proper and to keep within balance on his appropriations, to make the funds go far enough to take care of the job of giving service to the public. I will say this, and I know

this is so, because it was pretty well covered in the hearings; he is up against this kind of a situation, with tremendous pressure all the time for new service. I ask the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] to correct me if I am not right, but it is going to be necessary to provide 6,000 or 7,000 new clerks and carriers to carry on the load and give the service that the people require in 1957. The gentleman indicates that that is correct. That is the situation we are faced with. If we are not prepared to provide service, we are not in too good a position to raise the rates.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman one further question?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. My original question was directed to the point of how the Postmaster General, with the pressures for increased services and with the problem of budgeting 12 to 18 months ahead of time, is going to avoid this sort of situation again, and not lay himself open again to what I think has been an unfair castigation to which he has been subjected.

Mr. TABER. That is evidence that the Postmaster General has done something and kept things moving.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is it not correct that nearly all of the funds requested in this deficiency appropriation come about because of the extension and expansion of the Post Office Department, and that comes from the public itself demanding these additional services?

Mr. TABER. Yes; and it results from the change in the mode of living of the people, the number of people we have, and the growing of age of that group of youngsters who were born right after the war.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman not agree with me that whatever may have been said with regard to the management of the Department, and personally I think that it has been managed well, we ought not to punish the people who work in the Post Office Department because of the need for funds? These funds go to the people who work in the Post Office Department, the carriers, the clerks, the people who work in the service down there. Is there any good reason the gentleman can see why we should not go ahead and allow these funds to pay them?

Mr. TABER. I can see no good reason, and I also feel that the patrons of the Post Office Department are entitled to service. We ought to provide it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We have no right to punish them.

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], the chairman of the committee in charge of this bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been so fully discussed in the last few weeks that it is not my intention to prolong the discussion at this time, but I do think there are certain facts this body should know when it votes on the proposal before it.

Last year the Postmaster General submitted his budget estimates for the fiscal year 1957 and he requested \$3 billion to run the Post Office Department. I have heard the statement made on this floor many times that there is not a budget of a single department of this Government that you could not cut 10 percent without hurting the department.

Our committee studied these estimates very carefully. We held hearings for weeks. We did not cut him 10 percent, we did not cut him 5 percent. The Congress did not cut him even 1 percent. We cut him \$15,660,000, which was one-half of 1 percent. It seems to me the Postmaster General could have absorbed a cut as small as that had he so desired.

That appropriation of \$3 billion is divided into five separate items—administration, research, operations, transportation, finance and facilities. He is asking now only for the appropriation of additional funds for operations. Let us see what the situation is as to operations. He requested \$2,118,880,000 for operations. We cut that request only \$5,440,000. Under the law, we have allowed the Post Office Department transfer authority that is not enjoyed by any of the other departments of Government so far as I know except the military. But, the Congress permits them to transfer up to 5 percent from one item to another. They transferred from other items to operations a net of \$11,290,000 which gave them \$5,850,000 more than they requested for the operations of the Post Office Department.

It is true, as the gentleman from New Jersey said, that when they presented their full request to the committee for the fiscal year 1958, they told us at that time they were going to ask for \$53 million in supplemental funds, but at the same time that the Postmaster General told us he was going to ask for these funds, the Budget Director told us that he had not decided to allow them.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not true that the Bureau of the Budget last July agreed on \$30 million?

Mr. GARY. Last July?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes, indeed; last July.

Mr. GARY. No, sir; not according to my knowledge.

Mr. CANFIELD. That was sent to the other body. It was approved by the Bureau of the Budget and sent to the other body.

Mr. GARY. It did not come to the House.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true.

Mr. GARY. The only information that we had came from a conversation that the clerk of our committee had with the Director of the Budget in January or February of this year. He told our clerk that he had not decided to allow anything. He said that last year the Post Office Department had asked for \$53 million; that he had gotten them down to \$20 million, and he did not know whether he would allow them anything. Let me say to the gentleman that the first request sent to the Congress for additional funds came on March 12.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am sorry to disagree with my friend, but I must point out that the first request was sent to the other body and the subcommittee on appropriations of the other body received that request on July 12, 1956, in the amount of \$30 million and the Post Office Department was then told, "Hold off until next year and then we will do business with you."

Mr. GARY. May I say to the gentleman that appropriations under the Constitution originate in the House. I do not know what was sent to the other body, but certainly any request, since this body has the authority to originate appropriations, should be sent to the House of Representatives. As I was saying, the first request that we received was on March 12 of this year. Before submitting that request, the Postmaster General came to my office and told me he needed additional funds and he needed them promptly. I promised him if he would submit his request, he would have an immediate hearing. Just as soon as that request reached our committee I tried to set the hearings for Tuesday of the following week. The Postmaster General himself requested a postponement of those hearings because, he stated, he had already made engagements to appear before the legislative committee to testify on rates during the week and, consequently, the hearings were postponed for 1 week at his request. The next week we heard his request, and as we listened to him, we found out that the antideficiency law had been violated. If anyone questions whether or not that law has been violated, let him look at page 171 of the hearings of our subcommittee. There you will find a very complete table of the apportionments for the year.

The antideficiency law requires that these apportionments be made so that there will not be a deficiency at the end of the year. The initial apportionments were made on that basis, but you will find they were revised on July 10, 1956; they were revised again on July 13, 1956. That is, there were slight changes in the apportionments but very slight. They were revised again on August 30 and on October 4, 1956. Then on December 14, 1956, is the time that they began to take the money from the third and fourth quarter funds and use them in the second quarter. When they came to the revision of February 4, 1957, they transferred large sums of money from the fourth quarter to the second and third quarters. According to their own testimony, they knew long before February 4 that there was going to be deficit and, yet, they knew that these transfers were being made—then with that knowledge they deliberately transferred funds from the fourth quarter to the second and third quarters instead of coming to the Congress and asking for additional appropriations.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Who made these quarterly apportionments? The Postmaster General or the Director of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. GARY. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget made the apportionments at the request of the Postmaster General.

Mr. MURRAY. The Postmaster General has no authority to make those apportionments.

Mr. GARY. But he does have the power to request them.

Mr. MURRAY. Who made the apportionments back to the second and third quarters or the first quarter?

Mr. GARY. The Bureau of the Budget, at the request of the Postmaster General.

Mr. MURRAY. If anyone is to blame, it is the Bureau of the Budget and not the Postmaster General.

Mr. GARY. Well, I am sure the Bureau of the Budget would not have made the change in the apportionments if it had not been requested by the Postmaster General. I am not trying to fix blame. I am trying to give this body the facts in this case.

Mr. MURRAY. There has been some criticism of the Postmaster General, because he did not come before Congress last fall. The Congress was not in session, and he had no opportunity to come before the Congress before this January. Is that not correct?

Mr. GARY. He said he knew he was going to have a deficiency in July, and the Congress did not adjourn until August. In that connection, I may add that I have just been reliably informed that no request was made to the Senate for additional funds last July. The Post Office Department requested the Budget Bureau to approve additional funds, but the request was refused.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Inasmuch as the Director of the Budget and the Postmaster General are both Republicans, why not apportion the blame instead of putting it all on the Postmaster General?

Mr. GARY. I am not trying to put the blame on anybody. I have simply stated the facts. I have said that the law was violated, and the General Accounting Office has also said that the law has been violated. I insert the report of the House Appropriations Committee at this point to substantiate my position:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT OPERATIONS

The committee considered an estimate of \$47 million contained in House Document No. 115, and recommends an appropriation of \$41 million. Approval of this action by Congress will result in there being available for operations in 1957 a total of \$2,165,730,000, which includes the result of the exercise of transfer authority by the Department, and is \$46,850,000 more than the original estimate for 1957, and \$51,290,000 more than the appropriation made by the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act, 1957.

In spite of the increases in availability of funds by transfers, the Department has been operating at a rate of obligation which, the witness threatened, would require the cessation of postal service "completely for 2 weeks" in the event the requests were denied.

The committee reviewed with the Department and with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget the details of the apportionment requests of the Department and the subsequent approvals by the Bureau. This review coupled with an analysis of the obli-

gations incurred, established the fact that all operations have been geared to an inevitable deficiency. It seems abundantly clear that the Department made no effort to operate within even the augmented appropriation, and that the apportionments approved by the Bureau of the Budget openly gave Executive approval to this course of action, contrary to law. It must be pointed out that the very same Director of the Budget who approved the various reapportionment requests leading directly to this deficiency at the same time "specifically said I would not send up a supplemental for those amounts."

Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended in 1950, was designed to preclude the situation which now arises. In discussing the law on the floor of the House on May 10, 1950, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] said of paragraph 1 of subsection c:

"This is designed to insure that appropriations which are available for a fiscal year, or for other time periods—usually related to fiscal years—will not be obligated at a rate which would exhaust the appropriation prior to the end of the period for which the appropriation was made, and thus result in a need for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation, or an increase in the authorization for administrative expenses of a corporation or in drastic curtailment of the activity for which the appropriation or authorization was made."

The Postmaster General requested the General Accounting Office to issue an opinion as to whether or not the law had been complied with. Today, a letter (B-131361) from the Comptroller General states, in pertinent part, as follows:

"The necessity for a deficiency appropriation has been acknowledged by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the President as evidenced by the transmittal on March 12, 1957, to the Congress of a request for additional funds for operations of the Post Office Department during the fiscal year 1957 in the amount of \$47 million, the amount of your request for that purpose as received by the Bureau of the Budget January 4, 1957, before the date of the last reapportionment listed above. Also, you issued Postmaster General Order 56314, dated April 5, 1957, which would curtail the services of the Post Office Department in several respects if it becomes effective.

"If it is determined by the Congress that the deficiency appropriation is necessary for 'Operations' or if the services of the Post Office Department are drastically curtailed in the event no deficiency appropriation is made, there could be no question but that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget had not complied with the requirements of subsection (c) (1) of section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended, title 31 United States Code, section 665. It should be noted, however, that the penal provision contained in subsection (1) (1) of the act is applicable only to violations of subsections (a), (b), or (h) of the act and not to subsection (c) (1).

"The House hearings on the Post Office Department's request for supplemental funds for operations for 1957 show that, when the Department requested the reapportionment of its funds, it did so in the belief that the requested pattern of management of its funds for the fiscal year would result in the necessity for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation. Such action is not technically a violation of any specific provision of the Anti-Deficiency Act. However, it is not consistent with the spirit and purpose of the act."

Although the items involved in the request all result from actions contrary to the law, a majority of the committee feel that the necessity for maintaining service to the public is an overriding consideration. Of the amount requested, approximately \$2 million meets the test of paragraph 1 of subsection

(e) as an exception to the prohibition of deficiency apportioning, the balance does not. The committee recognizes that certain mitigating circumstances surround an additional \$17 million of the estimate in that the effective date of the reclassification portion of Public Law 68, 84th Congress, although technically prior to the transmission of the estimates was, in fact, subsequent to the preparation of the estimates for printing and transmission.

The administrative decisions necessary during the interim pending approval of this appropriation have been and will continue to be unfortunate. Had these decisions been made nearly a year ago, when they should have been, the present situation would not have arisen. It is most regrettable that a service so vital to the economy of our Nation, and affecting personally and individually each of our people, has thus been so callously jeopardized by the injudicious action of the executive branch which now seeks to escape justifiable criticism by overtly threatening the Congress.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman says the law has been violated. Apparently there is no penalty for a violation of that law. Does the gentleman agree with me that we could determine responsibility very quickly by just passing a simple resolution introduced in this body to bring somebody to account for the expenditures and the violation of this law?

Mr. GARY. I think the Congress could fix the blame if it desired. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. Is it not a fact that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget at least turned down the request of the Postmaster General for supplemental funds? Is it not also the fact that when the supplemental request for the various agencies was sent up, it was the chairman who notified the Postmaster General that his item was not contained in a list specifically designated as emergency items?

Mr. GARY. Yes. The request was sent up on March 12. When we held our hearings the Postmaster General insisted he had to have this money immediately. The chairman of the committee called his attention to the fact that this item had been sent to us with numerous other items, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget had been requested to mark the items that were urgent, and that the Post Office appropriation was not included in the list of urgent matters. The Director of the Budget did subsequently write a letter to the committee designating the item as urgent. The letter arrived on April 3.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Knowing of the complete fairness of the gentleman from Virginia, I am asking this question with reference to the future rather than the past, and I am directing a very similar question to the gentleman from Virginia that I directed to the gentleman from New York. I would like to know first of all if there is a certain latitude within which the Director of the Budget may

approve transfers from one quarter to an earlier quarter.

Mr. GARY. Not if they will bring about a deficiency; but here is the idea: Whenever the head of a department finds he is going to have a deficiency, that he needs more money, then he should come before the Congress before that deficiency is incurred so that the Congress will have the right to pass upon the question as to whether or not he should have the additional funds.

We did not have that cooperation in this instance, but to the contrary, the Postmaster General came before our committee after the funds had been overspent in the first three quarters and said: "You give us this additional money or else!"

He said we had but two alternatives; one, to cut off the main service entirely on June 15 for the rest of the month, or else begin to curtail service immediately if we were not going to allow the funds.

Mr. JOHANSEN. One further question, if the gentleman will permit: In a subsequent year, if in any quarter prior to the fourth it is found that the funds allocated to that quarter are not adequate, do I understand that the Postmaster General may with the approval of the Director of the Budget Bureau use funds for a later quarter, provided the borrowing does not create a deficit for the entire year?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Then if it is determined that it would create a deficit, the Postmaster General is supposed to come to the Congress before the borrowing is done.

Mr. GARY. Exactly.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am interested in how it works.

Mr. GARY. In the present instance the Postmaster General admits that he knew there was going to be a deficit when the transfers were made, yet no request was made to the Congress.

Mr. JOHANSEN. That is a debatable point but I am asking the gentleman as to procedure.

Mr. GARY. There is no debate as to what the Postmaster General said before our committee. He testified that he knew there would be this deficiency.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. STEED. The justification that was contained in the message from the President on the deficiency bill known as House Document 115 gave certain reasons why they needed this \$47 million. When the Post Office Department representatives appeared before our committee, some admission was made as to the fact that the justifications contained in the President's message were not accurate, and they gave some other reasons at that time why they needed the \$47 million. Will the gentleman explain to the House this discrepancy?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

(Mr. CANNON yielded 5 additional minutes to Mr. GARY.)

Mr. GARY. There were two items. One item clearly came within the provisions of the antideficiency law. The

Congress after the original requests had been submitted passed a law authorizing the Post Office Department to pay the postal employees while they are engaged in military service in the Reserves. That cost \$2 million.

In addition, there was another item that they admitted did not come specifically within the exception in the law. The Congress prior to the time they submitted their budget request passed a law increasing postal salaries. They had taken that law into consideration, but there was a provision in that law requiring the reclassification of postal employees, and that provision did not become effective until the following December.

The Post Office Department representatives testified that when they put that provision into effect they found it cost more than they had anticipated by \$17 million. Our committee, although realizing it was a technical violation of the law, did not want to be technical and recommended the \$17 million. Frankly I think we should also have recommended the \$2 million which was overlooked.

Mr. TABOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABOR. The Postmaster General went to the Budget Bureau on the 10th of July last year and the Bureau called the Senate committee which said that it was too late in the session for the submission of a supplemental request. After that, on his next possible appearance before the Congress, on the 15th of January, he told the subcommittee he was going to have a deficit of \$53 million and after that he followed the thing up with the budget to get a budget estimate. What does the gentleman think the Postmaster General should have done? Should he have immediately on the 1st of July or the 1st of August, when he found out he did not get the first budget estimate, curtailed the operation of the post office at a time when it was impossible for the Congress to do anything or should he have done what he did? I would like to have the gentleman clarify that.

Mr. GARY. I will say that was a question for the administration to handle. When two of his administrative departments disagree the decision as to which is right rests with the President. I have not attempted to fix the responsibility. I have said that the law has been violated. The General Accounting Office has sustained that position. I am not going to quibble with the gentleman as to which department violated the law. If this had been handled properly there would not have been any question about adequate funds being supplied. The fault is certainly not with the Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Some of us are wondering, regardless of who may or may not be to blame, whether or not this appropriation of \$41 million is sufficient to restore to the country an adequate mail service on the same basis that we have had up to June 30?

Mr. GARY. That is another question for the Postmaster General to answer. He said that he could not get by with a penny less than \$47 million.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What is the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. GARY. I do not know. We only cut his appropriation one-half of 1 percent. We thought he could have absorbed that without difficulty, but he has not absorbed any of it. He is asking for more money than he requested originally. If we give him the \$17 million that our subcommittee recommends he will have \$1,340,000 more than he requested originally.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; but perhaps the amount granted in this bill is not enough. How did the gentleman's committee get at that figure?

Mr. GARY. I may say to the gentleman that I am against the \$41 million. I am for the \$19 million. I want him to live within the amount that the Congress appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. TABOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, the question before us boils down to this: Is the Congress of the United States going to control the expenditures of this Government or are we going to turn it over to bureaucrats? That is the whole question. The Hoover Commission has recommended that the Congress be given greater control over governmental expenditures. I think that is proper, because the Members of Congress are elected by the people and they represent the people.

The most effective control that we have today is the control that is set forth in this antideficiency law. Once we relinquish that control, once we capitulate to the threats and tactics of the Postmaster General, then we have relinquished our most effective control. To me, that is of far greater consequence than the temporary inconvenience of the mail users.

I have received numerous letters and telegrams and messages on this situation. Somebody said that when we hear from the rural people we will change our minds. Let me read you a telegram I received from a rural delivery carrier in one of the Western States:

Congratulations on your subcommittee recommendations for the Post Office Department. Patrons contacted today are not interested in Saturday service, did not care if rates went up where post office could pay own way, wondered why they got so much junk mail. I serve 320 families, 64-mile route, 10 years service.

I have heard a lot of talk about the mail service of foreign countries here today. The first speech that I made on the floor of this House was in favor of a salary increase for postal employees. It was in 1945 and at that time they had not had a salary increase for 20 years. I think we have got to pay our postal employees salaries commensurate with the salaries paid by private industries. I am for giving them good salaries, but whenever we talk of what the foreign services are doing, if you will just compare our pay of postal employees with theirs, you

will see that there is a great difference. In addition to that, we have not increased our postal rates on first- and second-class mail since 1932. I am for an increase in the postal rates to make each class of mail pay its own way. Let me say that I appeared before Mr. MURRAY's committee last week and testified for three-quarters of an hour on that subject. I noticed that the Government-subsidized Time magazine said that I roared. I think it is time for somebody to roar about the failure of the users of the mail in this country to pay for the services that they are receiving from the Post Office Department.

Just one other thought. Our people have been inconvenienced by the order of last Saturday. That was a hurried order. I found one situation in my city Friday night when I returned home. A contract station called me and said "We are not permitted to accept parcel post packages on Saturday." I called the Postmaster General at his hotel in Washington, and that order was countermanded immediately.

Now, I do say this, since industry and business are going to a 5-day week the time has come when we should begin to curtail our Saturday service to some extent. I do not think it ought to be discontinued, but I do think there should be some study along that line. I am told by the Post Office Department that by not delivering third class mail on Saturdays we can save \$10 million a year. When that class of mail is not paying the expense of its delivery, why should we not save \$10 million a year. I want to see the people of this country get all the service that they pay for, but when they do not pay for the service, I do not think they can expect champagne service at beer prices.

There is just one other feature that I want to discuss. I think there are some places that we can cut the service that will not hurt. This administration has decentralized the postal service. What they have done is this: They have established 15 brandnew regional offices throughout the United States. They have established 91 new district offices throughout the United States. In each of these regional offices they have practically duplicated the setup of the office here in Washington. In the district offices they have employed additional help, and while there is not a complete duplication, there is a partial duplication. They have put into those offices a lot of high salaried personnel that we have not had before. Frankly, I cannot see that the service has been benefited one iota.

I understand the statement was made the other day that prior to decentralization the mail piled up here in Washington. I was told the other day that one of my constituents had a question of classification that had been tied up in the district and regional offices for 1 year and in the Washington office for 2 months, making a total of 14 months.

Now with respect to these regional and district offices: I used to enjoy vaudeville. I can remember a corny joke I heard in vaudeville many years ago. It probably stuck in my mind because it was so corny. Two would-be comedians

come out on the stage and one of them said to the other, "John, if that post over there were to fall on us, what would you do?" And the other said, "I would call the postmaster." The first one said, "Why?" And just as quick as a flash he said, "To get the post off us."

Today, you would not know whether to call the postmaster, the district manager, the regional director, or a supervisor. The situation has become so complicated under decentralization that nobody knows today where the postmaster's jurisdiction ceases, where the district manager's jurisdiction begins, or where the regional director fits into the picture. There is a wide area for economies in this confusing setup.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has expired.

THE TRUTH ABOUT SUMMERFIELD AND THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, a great furor has arisen over the attempt of the Postmaster General, Mr. Summerfield, to sandbag Congress into giving him the total amount of money he requests for the operation of the Post Office Department. Here are the facts.

The committee appropriated practically the entire budget request for the current fiscal year which began July 1, 1956. Until a few years ago it was the general practice among the Federal bureaus and departments to use all of the money appropriated such department for any one fiscal year before the end of the year and come back to the next Congress and ask for a deficiency appropriation. This practice meant that the Congress had absolutely no control over expenditures but was at the mercy of the departments which could spend under such practice the sums of money they saw fit instead of the sums appropriated by the Congress. To prevent this practice, a law known as the antideficiency law was passed by the Congress. This law requires the heads of the various departments to apportion the money for expenditure of a certain maximum amount in each quarter, the total not to exceed the amount appropriated for the entire fiscal year. Most of the departments now follow the law and if an emergency arises during the year which makes it impossible for the department to operate on the appropriation previously made by the Congress, the department comes to the Appropriations Committee before it makes the expenditures and gets the authority of the Congress to exceed the quarterly amount by the sum required for the emergency.

During the current fiscal year which began July 1 of last year, Mr. Summerfield did not follow this practice but in October, again in December, and again in January changed the allocations of the money appropriated to him and spent it needlessly to support the 15 regional offices set up by him and which are of

no earthly use but which cost millions of dollars more than the operation of the Department costs when the affairs of the Department were administered from Washington. In addition many unnecessary district offices were set up at additional cost.

So instead of coming to the Congress before he spent sums in excess of his quarterly allocations, he waited until January when he came to the subcommittee which makes appropriations for his Department and demanded that a certain amount be appropriated for the remaining months of the year. This was a distinct violation of the antideficiency law.

In the meantime, he asked the Budget Bureau to send a request for additional funds to the Appropriations Committee. The Budget Bureau believing such funds unnecessary and expressing that belief to members of the subcommittee handling these appropriations, refused to request the committee for additional funds. However Mr. Summerfield continued to pressure his fellow Republican, Mr. Brundage, head of the Budget Bureau, until the latter surrendered and sent a request to the committee on March 12 for the additional appropriation.

The committee after a hearing and careful consideration of the request decided that while Mr. Summerfield had violated the law and spent money illegally, an appropriation of \$17 million additional would be justified because an act of Congress had increased the cost by \$17 million. Mr. Summerfield was told that this amount would be appropriated when the committee could take regular action on the bill.

Instead of doing as other department heads do and accepting the money appropriated by the Congress, he immediately threatened to curtail the postal service in various ways. Finally in order to put tremendous pressure upon the Congress to do just as he wished, he proposed to close the post offices on Saturday, to stop issuing money orders, and otherwise curtail the postal service. He is quite arrogant and apparently has a contempt for Congress as so many of the bureaucrats do.

SHALL THE PEOPLE THROUGH THEIR CONGRESS, OR THE BUREAUCRATS, CONTROL EXPENDITURES?

This is the vital question posed by Mr. Summerfield's actions in violation of the law and his threats to curtail the postal service. We are being constantly urged to cut expenditures so that the people can be given a tax reduction. The Appropriations Committee of which I am a member has been trying to do just that and has succeeded in making many cuts. Now the question is, Do the people back home want the Congress to surrender to Mr. Summerfield and let him say what amount is to be spent for postal service or do you want your Representatives in Congress to hold the purse strings? This is the problem and this is the real question involved. Whatever Mr. Summerfield may say to the contrary, this is the inescapable problem posed by his contemptuous and arrogant conduct toward the Congress.

SUMMERFIELD WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CURTAILED POSTAL SERVICE

If your postal service is curtailed temporarily or permanently, it will be the fault of Mr. Summerfield who violated the law by making unauthorized expenditures—many say for political purposes—during the first 9 months of the year. If we surrender to him and permit him to violate the antideficiency law, the other departments will demand the same treatment. If so, the Congress might as well shut up shop and turn the handling of your tax money over to the bureaucrats.

It is not a question of whether we shall appropriate money for foreign aid or for any other purpose. The Appropriations Committee will take care of cutting foreign aid and other funds where possible, but we should not and cannot be expected to surrender to the arrogant demands of a power-drunk bureaucrat. I have, and will continue, to vote against any such surrender.

THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the House this week approved the second appropriations bill for the Post Office Department during this session—the first being the regular annual departmental appropriations bill, carrying funds in excess of \$3 billion for postal services—the second bill being a supplemental appropriation, carrying an additional \$41 million for the Department.

The Postmaster General—General Summerfield—has publicly contended that this latter appropriation is needed for the operation of all the services in the Department through June 30, the end of the Government fiscal year.

As indicated, the Congress has appropriated to date more than \$3 billion for the Department, the exact amount being \$3,197,000,000 plus the additional \$41 million this week approved. Besides these appropriations, it should be pointed out that Mr. Summerfield, the Postmaster General, has the authority to transfer funds from one operation to another at his discretion.

Notwithstanding the cooperation of the Congress in providing these funds for services to the public by the Department, the Postmaster General has threatened to completely shut down the operation of the Post Office if the full funds he demanded is not immediately provided.

It should be pointed out that the Bureau of the Budget in the White House, that initially passes on all departmental requests for funds, has twice rejected the Postmaster General's requests for additional funds. The Budget Bureau only recently submitted its approval for the supplemental funds to Congress. Had this latter request been received earlier, the Congress could have acted earlier and the apparent urgency of the situation would have been avoided. The Committee on Appropriations and the Congress have acted in accordance with

usual and customary procedure in these matters and not under force of threats, intimidation, and pressure.

Certainly, there exists no desire on the part of anyone to curtail essential postal services to the public. However, many Members of Congress feel that the Post Office Department should practice some economy as other agencies of the Government. Hearings before the Post Office Committee on the Appropriations Committee have established that the Department is expending huge sums of money in the setting up of 15 new regional supervisory offices and about 100 new branch supervisory offices throughout the United States. These new offices have been staffed by highly paid personnel and increases in funds requested by the Department have resulted in expenditures of funds being transferred from services to support these new offices. There exists the opinion here in Washington that the Postmaster General has ordered limited service curtailment—for a limited time—for two primary reasons; the first being to dramatize the need for increasing the postal rates to the public which he has long advocated and the other reason being political.

With more than \$3 billion available in appropriations to the Department, plus the authority to transfer funds from one operation to another, there certainly should be no need to suspend mail service, even temporarily, to the public.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, to one who does not know anything about the operations of the Post Office Department—except that as he puts a stamp on a letter and drops it in the mail box, the addressee gets it, and on time, and that sometimes one gets a letter—this does seem to be about as ridiculous a situation as even the Congress of the United States can get into.

We created the Post Office Department. We have written certain laws telling the Department what it must do; what kind of mail it shall accept and what the charge for that service shall be, how much the employees shall be paid, and many other directions and restrictions.

We tell the Postmaster General what to do and how, but we do not give him enough money to do it—then we complain when he refuses to carry out our orders when, if he did, he would violate the law we have written.

Now it just happens that we have a Republican postmaster and all at once the charge is that the law is being violated.

When given the privilege of coming here, what most amazed me was the fact that the Congress could have a deficiency bill. It has always been my thought that when money was given to me or when I earned money and I spent it for a particular purpose, that was it; that was the end of that incident. But inquiry of the Parliamentarian as to how many deficiency bills could be brought in elicited the information that we could have as many as the congressional committee wanted to bring in. And if a

Department did not get enough money the first time, it could come back and ask again; and if it did not get enough money then, they could come back again and again and ultimately the Congress would give the Department what was needed.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We have 5 deficiency bills before us today, do we not—5 more?

Mr. HOFFMAN. We may have more; I do not know. But having created the Department, and having a Postmaster General under whose direction it is supposed to operate, and having told him by law what he should do—let me interrupt myself. There are two remedies. We can either curtail the service or—well, the other one would not work. That is, we cannot prevent people being born and learning to read and write and wanting to get postal service, nor can we prevent the expansion of the service demanded by increasing businesses. I would not subscribe to either. But fortunately our population has grown, as has business. We have had some refugees, some others have been admitted and apparently many wish to write letters to the friends they have left abroad, telling what a wonderful country this is, and they want to get letters. What a howl would have gone up if the Postmaster had curtailed the service before he did. And that is apparently what he should have done if he had desired to meet the approval of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] or if the Bureau of the Budget failed to abide by the strict letter of law.

If there is a Member of this House who has not had requests for the extension of rural routes, for carrier service in growing communities, for additional service—all of which cost dollars—it would be a pleasure to meet that gentleman, because certainly he must be happier than some of the rest of us are today.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY. There has been a good deal said about how unusual it is for the Post Office Department to ask for a supplemental appropriation or a deficiency appropriation. With the gentleman's permission, may I read figures showing what has happened with appropriations for the Post Office Department?

In 1947 Congress gave the Post Office Department a supplemental appropriation of \$93 million. In 1948 Congress voted \$172,700,000 in a supplemental appropriation for the Post Office Department. In 1949, there was a supplemental appropriation of \$140,800,000. In 1950, it was \$71,400,000; in 1951, \$29,400,000; and in 1952, \$250,000.

Now, let us see what has happened under Postmaster General Summerfield. In 1953 he turned back—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no?

Mr. MURRAY. He turned back \$83,574,247.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman not realize Mr. Summerfield is a Republican Postmaster General?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes, I am just giving the gentleman facts and figures.

In 1955 he turned back \$108,724,572. Next year he turned back \$42,993,628. So in 3 successive years he turned back over \$200 million of the appropriation given by Congress.

Since he has been Postmaster General, since 1953, this is his second request for a supplemental appropriation. In 1956 he received a supplemental appropriation of \$16 million. The supplemental appropriation now pending is the second one he has asked for.

Mr. HOFFMAN. At any time during that period did the gentleman hear any complaint from the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. MURRAY. None whatever.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Was the gentleman listening?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Did the gentleman hear any word of commendation of the Postmaster General from certain sources?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman mean during this debate?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I mean at any time, for the money that was turned back.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Of course the gentleman realizes that each of us cannot hear everything that is said. That is just impossible. Inasmuch as the Congress has been under the control of our Democratic friends, I would not expect there would be too much commendation along that line.

Repeatedly it has been said here that there has been a violation of the law. We have heard read the letter from the Comptroller General. As far as it was my privilege to understand the situation, the only violation there has been was because the Bureau of the Budget, and the chairman of the Post Office Committee will set me right on it, did not send up a notification of a deficiency as soon as it should.

Mr. MURRAY. That is entirely correct. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget failed to send up the request when it was first made last July and held it up until March 12 of this year. I do not know the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, but he gave as an excuse that he understood the revenues of the Department were increasing, which is true, and that there would be a \$20 million increase in postal revenues. He thought that the Postmaster General could use the increased revenue to pay for the operating expenses of the Department, which of course is not true. All postal revenues go into the General Treasury.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He made a mistake of about \$20 million. He thought it would come to the Post Office Department and it went into the Treasury of the United States. That is the situation, is it not? He thought a saving might be made?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is what all the, if the word may be used, "squawk" is about here today. That is the only foundation there is, as I can read the record,

for the charge of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] that the law has been violated. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], when he was talking here a few moments ago, referred directly to a violation not by the Bureau of the Budget, not by the Postmaster General, but by his own committee. I had not heard that until today when it slipped out. The violation has been nothing but a technical one, for which there is no penalty, as I understand it, and if I am wrong, again I will ask the chairman of the Post Office Committee to correct me. Is there any penalty attached to the violation of which the Bureau of the Budget may be guilty?

Mr. MURRAY. I understand there is no penalty whatsoever.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, where and what do we get? Charges that the Postmaster General has violated the law and is responsible for the present curtailment of the service. A political charge that is without foundation. Where does the blame belong? Right over there with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. He has been familiar with the situation all along. When the Postmaster General came up finally and said that he would not violate the law by continuing service as it then existed, that unless he was given money to operate as we had directed one of two things must happen—he must either violate the law or he must curtail the services.

The gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON]—I cannot say he got his back up—nobody knows what transpires in his head—but he decided, at least said, the Postmaster General was holding a gun at the head of the Congress, and was bluffing, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] called what he characterized the Postmaster's bluff. And what happened? The Postmaster General just was not bluffing. He obeyed the law, and stood by his guns and cut the service as he was forced to do. The present curtailment in services is due to the action of no one except that of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. There on the Democratic side sits the person who is responsible for the recent cut in service, for the failure of postal employees to be on their jobs. What are we to do about it. The House will do as it should have done a week or two ago. It will appropriate the necessary funds notwithstanding all the talk of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. The only thing that was wrong, as I can read the record, was that when the third quarter rolled around, they transacted their business by using the fourth-quarter funds. The Postmaster General, if I understand the situation transferred funds supposed to be used after one date over to an earlier period. Is that what it was? They transferred money, for example, from the third to the second quarter in order to continue to operate?

Mr. MURRAY. They transferred funds from the fourth quarter several different times to the first, second, and third. Those transfers were made at the direction and with the approval and on

the order of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And nobody said anything about it at the time; did they?

Mr. MURRAY. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the only thing the Postmaster could have done at that time is what he later did, and that was to curtail the services; was it not?

Mr. MURRAY. Certainly.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from the Third Congressional District who is so ably representing his district, who is on the Post Office Committee.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman. I was disturbed by the answer that was given by the distinguished gentleman, my good friend from Virginia [Mr. GARY] when the question was asked, I believe, by the gentleman from New York as to what the Postmaster General should have done if he discovered a deficiency and he was going to have to transfer these funds at a time when the Congress was not in session, and the only answer given was that that was an administrative problem.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no, no. What he could have done was to have done then just what he did later and that was to cut the services and that is the only thing the Postmaster could have done at any time. Why all this hollering and yelling and making of charges without justification now. The only thing I can figure out is that the Postmaster General happens to be a Republican and this is the time—this is the year when they are after the Republican Party with 1958 in mind. They loved Ike; many of them supported Ike but now they would tear him and his administration to pieces.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. GARY. I was asked the question a few moments ago as to what the Postmaster General could do if he went to the Budget Director on two occasions and asked for a transfer of funds which he had to have, and the Budget Director refused to give it to him. They asked me what he could do under those circumstances. What he could have done was to have gone to the President of the United States who is the coordinating officer and he could have directed the Budget Director to send the proper request to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Nonsense. The Congress knew the money was needed, the Congressmen calling the tune but did not want to pay the piper. Yes; and if the President had authorized the expenditure we would have heard a howl go up all over the place. The politicians would have had something to talk about other than the helicopter, the speed at which his chauffeur drives, a red spot on his nose, and the President's health. The only thing the Postmaster General could have done and the only thing he can do today, and the only thing he can do in the future when he comes before the Appropriations Committee of the Congress and the Congress fails to give him money necessary to operate is

to cut off the services or violate the law. Now, if our people are displeased, if they are sore about anything, they should direct their wrath to and at the gentleman, as I said before, from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. There is where they should go. He is the gentleman responsible for the lack of funds which cut down the postal service, the loss of compensation of employees who were out of work. The gentleman from Missouri is the boss of the Appropriations Committee, he is a master of inconsistency, but he is not, as yet, running the Department of the Post Office—as he has recently learned the hard way. I stand by this statement—there is not a Member of this House who has not had requests for additional services either for an extension of routes or for more frequent deliveries in, for example, carrier service in cities which have grown—and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] seems to be nodding his head in the affirmative. Evidently, he has heard from his home folks as have we all. I hope when this bill comes up for a vote the gentleman will not only vote to give the present Postmaster General what he needs, but you will have a word of praise as other good members of your party have had since this issue came up.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. COLLIER. For the purpose of the RECORD, and for the economy-minded Members of this Congress, it might be well to point out that this deficiency appropriation in toto represents one-seventeenth of 1 percent of the entire Federal budget.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] thought it sufficient to hang a political charge on, and that is all this argument is about. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] just for a few days thought he was Postmaster General. Being from Missouri, he asked to be shown—and he was. What the Congress has done was to create a Department, tell it to operate in a certain way, and then the Committee on Appropriations, under the guidance of its chairman, for a few days refused deliberately to give the Postmaster General funds enough to carry out the orders of the Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the statements of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], the decision of the Comptroller General held that the law was violated. In response to a request of the Postmaster General for an opinion on this point, Comptroller Campbell wrote in a detailed and authoritative opinion on April 12, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, April 12, 1957.

DEAR MR. POSTMASTER GENERAL: Your letter of April 4, 1957, requests a statement of our findings resulting from a study of the records of the Post Office Department to ascertain

whether during fiscal year 1957 there has been a violation of the provisions of section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), commonly known as the Antideficiency Act. An informal request for similar advice was received from a staff member of the House Appropriations Committee following the hearings March 26 and 27, and April 3, 1957, before the Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office Appropriations, on the Post Office Department's supplemental request for funds for operations.

At the outset, we wish to explain that our review was made in a very limited time to obtain information readily available as to whether the Post Office Department had violated the Antideficiency Act. Because of the time limit, our review was restricted to a comparison of apportionments, by appropriation, approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the postal quarterly reporting periods ended October 19, 1956, and January 11, 1957, with obligations incurred for the same quarters as they appear in published statements of the Post Office Department. No over-obligation of the apportionments for those quarters was revealed by this comparison. Results of operations for the postal quarter ending April 5, 1957, were not available at the time of our review.

We did not review the obligations under administrative subdivisions of funds within the apportionments, but we were informed that in the quarter ended October 19, 1956, funds allotted to two regional directors had been overobligated by \$27,613 and the required reports to the President and the Congress were made on February 14, 1957.

Your letter, however, and the committee inquiry request our findings as to whether the provisions of the Antideficiency Act were violated during fiscal year 1957. This requires consideration not only of the question as to whether the apportionment of the funds for the fiscal year 1957 were over-obligated but also as to whether they were made in accordance with the provisions of that act, which provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

"(c) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this section, all appropriations or funds available for obligation for a definite period of time shall be so apportioned as to prevent obligation or expenditure thereof in a manner which would indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropriations for such period. * * *

"(d) (2) Any appropriation available to an agency, which is required to be apportioned under subsection (c) of this section, shall be apportioned or reapportioned in writing by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The head of each agency to which any such appropriation is available shall submit to the Bureau of the Budget information, in such form and manner and at such time or times as the Director may prescribe, as may be required for the apportionment of such appropriation. * * *

"(e) (1) No apportionment or reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate shall be made except upon a determination by such officer that such action is required because of (A) any laws enacted subsequent to the transmission to the Congress of the estimates for an appropriation which require expenditures beyond administrative control; or (B) emergencies involving the safety of human life, the protection of property, or the immediate welfare of individuals in cases where an appropriation has been made to enable the United States to make payment of, or contributions toward, sums which are required to be paid to individuals either in specific amounts fixed by law or in accordance with formulas prescribed by law.

"(2) In each case of an apportionment or a reapportionment which, in the judgment of the officer making such apportionment or reapportionment, would indicate a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate, such officer shall immediately submit a detailed report of the facts of the case to the Congress. In transmitting any deficiency or supplemental estimates required on account of any such apportionment or reapportionment, reference shall be made to such report."

Since the Department's supplemental request for funds for fiscal year 1957 is limited to the appropriation for operations, what is said hereinafter is addressed to that appropriation.

The apportionments of that appropriation, with a possible exception of about \$2 million referred to on page 97 of the House hearings on the second urgent deficiency appropriation bill, 1957, do not appear to come within the exceptions set out in subsection (e) (1) above and, apparently, subsection (e) was not relied upon in making the apportionments. The communication transmitting the supplemental estimates to the Congress March 12, 1957, contains no reference to any detailed report to the Congress of the facts involved as required in subsection (e) (2), and the testimony in these hearings contains no indication of reliance upon subsection (e) (1) in making the apportionments.

The apportionment of appropriations to prevent deficiency or supplemental appropriations was first required in the amendment to section 3679, Revised Statutes, contained in section 4 of the act of March 3, 1905, 33 Stat. 1257. Section 3679, Revised Statutes, was amended again by section 3 of the act of February 23, 1906, 34 Stat. 27, 48, and lastly, by section 1211 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951, 64 Stat. 765. Each of these amendments was intended to reduce further the need for deficiency or supplemental appropriations.

Even prior to the complete revision of section 3679 in the General Appropriation Act, 1951, the Anti-deficiency Act was considered to require that appropriations be apportioned so as to prevent either a deficiency appropriation or the suspension or drastic curtailment of an activity for lack of funds. In House Report No. 221, 79th Congress, 1st session, on the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1945, it is stated:

"The committee met with instances which indicated either a lack of knowledge or an utter disregard of the so-called antideficiency law (31 U. S. C. 665), in that agencies reported overobligations during the first half of the current fiscal year to an extent which places the Congress in the position either of granting additional funds or forcing the curtailment of operations which in some cases would be unwise and harmful. That sort of practice cannot be continued, particularly when the Congress is in continuous session. It must be stopped."

In House Report No. 1817, 79th Congress, 2d session, on the second deficiency appropriation bill, 1946, it is stated:

"Instances have occurred where agencies do not actually incur deficiencies but proceed at an obligational rate which make necessary either a deficiency appropriation or the suspension or drastic curtailment of an activity for lack of funds. The committee does not propose to tolerate that practice any longer. It intends to see that the antideficiency law (31 U. S. C. 665) is observed in letter and spirit and shall expect the Bureau of the Budget to report quarterly, starting at the close of the first quarter of the next fiscal year, the title of any appropriation not being administered in accordance with the letter and spirit of such law, the reasons therefor, and the name and position of the official immediately responsible."

The foregoing quotation was referred to in a letter dated August 22, 1946, of the As-

sistant Chief, Estimates, Bureau of the Budget, to the Postmaster General printed at page 116 of the Senate hearings on the second deficiency appropriation bill for 1947. As recorded on page 142 of those hearings, the Subcommittee on Deficiencies, Senate Committee on Appropriations, after hearing testimony as to deficiencies which had occurred in the Post Office Department, requested the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office to review the problem and submit a report thereon.

The Acting Director of Bureau of the Budget and the Acting Comptroller General jointly submitted a report on June 5, 1947, B-68949, to the Senate Committee on Appropriations with the understanding that the subcommittee desired recommendations (1) as to what can be done to control the use of appropriations so as to prevent the incurring of obligations at a rate which will lead to deficiency or supplemental appropriations or to curtailment of necessary activities if such appropriations are not made; and (2) to fix responsibility on those officers of the Government who incur deficiencies or obligate appropriations without proper authorization or at an excessive rate. Included in the report was a draft of legislation to accomplish those two purposes.

This draft of legislation to amend section 3679, Revised Statutes, with some revisions, was enacted as section 1211 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951. A section-by-section analysis of that proposed legislation appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 5, pages 6835-6836. It is stated in that analysis that subsection (1) (c) is "designed to insure that appropriations which are available for a fiscal year, or for other time periods—usually related to fiscal years—will not be obligated at a rate which would exhaust the appropriation prior to the end of the period for which the appropriation was made and thus result in a need

for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation, or an increase in the authorization for administrative expenses of a corporation, or in drastic curtailment of the activity for which the appropriation or authorization was made."

A drastic curtailment toward the close of a fiscal year of operations carried on under a fiscal year appropriation is a prima facie indication of a failure to so apportion an appropriation as to prevent obligation or expenditure thereof in a manner which would indicate a necessity for deficiency or supplemental appropriations for such period. In our view, this is the very situation the amendment of the law in 1950 was intended to remedy. This view is entirely consistent with the views expressed in the joint report dated June 5, 1947, of the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office. In view thereof and the legislative history of the Antideficiency Act set out above, subsection (c) (1) of the act must be, and is, construed as a mandate of the Congress that fiscal year appropriations be so apportioned as to prevent obligation or expenditure thereof in a manner which would indicate the necessity for either a deficiency or supplemental appropriation or a drastic curtailment of the activity for which an appropriation is made.

The responsibility for making the apportionments is vested in the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by subsection (d) (2) of the act, which also requires the head of the agency concerned to submit to the Bureau of the Budget information, in such form and manner and at such time or times as the Director may prescribe, as may be required for the apportionment of the appropriation. The apportionment and reapportionments as made by the Bureau of the Budget for the appropriation "Operations, Post Office Department, 1957," including transfers and reimbursements, are set out below:

Date	1st quarter	2d quarter	3d quarter	4th quarter
June 13, 1956.....	\$624,306,000	\$547,611,000	\$473,766,000	\$474,909,000
July 10, 1956.....	623,429,500	546,988,100	473,112,100	474,255,700
July 13, 1956.....	630,429,500	546,988,100	469,612,100	470,755,700
Aug. 30, 1956.....	630,326,100	546,988,100	469,612,100	470,755,700
Oct. 4, 1956.....	635,326,100	551,988,100	469,612,100	470,755,700
Dec. 14, 1956.....	635,326,100	561,988,000	466,612,000	463,884,900
Jan. 11, 1957.....	635,326,100	561,988,000	464,612,000	463,884,900
Feb. 4, 1957.....	635,326,100	561,988,000	484,612,000	443,884,900

The Post Office Department operates on 4-week accounting periods adjusted at the beginning and end of the fiscal year. The first-, second-, third-, and fourth-quarter columns in the above table actually represent 4 (less 1 day), 3, 3, and 3 (plus 2 days) accounting periods of 4 weeks each. The significant reapportionments were made on July 13 and December 14, 1956, and February 4, 1957. On July 13, 1956, the first quarter was increased \$7 million and the third and fourth quarters were decreased \$3,500,000 each. On December 14, 1956, the second quarter was increased \$10 million and the third and fourth quarters were further decreased by \$3 million and approximately \$7 million, respectively. On February 4, 1957, the third quarter was increased \$20 million and the fourth quarter was decreased by \$20 million. These 3 reapportionments decreased the fourth quarter apportionment by a total of approximately \$30,500,000, which resulted in the fourth quarter apportionment being \$40,727,100 less than the third quarter apportionment which covered 2 days less time.

The necessity for a deficiency appropriation has been acknowledged by the Director of the Bureau and the President as evidenced by the transmittal on March 12, 1957, to the Congress of a request for additional funds for operations of the Post Office Department during the fiscal year 1957 in the amount of \$47 million, the amount of your request for that purpose as received by the

Bureau of the Budget January 4, 1957, before the date of the last reapportionment listed above. Also, you issued Postmaster General Order 56314, dated April 5, 1957, which would curtail the services of the Post Office Department in several respects if it becomes effective.

If it is determined by the Congress that the deficiency appropriation is necessary for "Operations" or if the services of the Post Office Department are drastically curtailed in the event no deficiency appropriation is made, there could be no question but that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget had not complied with the requirements of subsection (c) (1) of section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended, 31 U. S. C. 665. It should be noted, however, that the penal provision contained in subsection (1) (1) of the act is applicable only to violations of subsections (a), (b), or (h) of the act and not to subsection (c) (1).

The House hearings on the Post Office Department's request for supplemental funds for operations for 1957 show that, when the Department requested the reapportionment of its funds, it did so in the belief that the requested pattern of management of its funds for the fiscal year would result in the necessity for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation. Such action is not technically a violation of any specific provision of the Antideficiency Act. However, it is not consistent with the spirit and purpose of the act.

Copies of this letter are being sent to the House Committee on Appropriations, to Senator Byrd, and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

As will be noted the Comptroller held that the Director of the Budget, at the repeated importunity of the Postmaster General, had violated the Antideficiency Act. That makes the Postmaster General in effect an accessory before the fact and his repeated insistence, in the language of the opinion, "not consistent with the spirit and purpose of the act. It is a reproach on both the administration and the Department. All the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten it."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of talk about Democratic attacks on the Postmaster General. I have a letter from a constituent of mine, a dentist out in Ohio, who happens to be a Republican. He says:

There is a persistent rumor being circulated locally that our Postmaster General has threatened to resign his office.

Frankly, since learning that our local post office will be locked Saturday, postal money orders will be discontinued effective April 15, and third-class mail will no longer be available, I am not merely in favor of such a resignation—I am definitely enthusiastic about it.

Maybe such a move might start a trend toward giving the country back to the people for a change. Goodness knows it has been long, long overdue. And then, there is that old-fashioned thought that most of us cling to—the postal service is by no stretch of the imagination a privilege. It is a right.

If the Postmaster General has handled his Chevrolet business in Michigan as inefficiently as he has the Postal Department, he is either broke or his personal finances must surely be in bad shape. Accordingly, and since it is just "not fittin'" that a man of his age and financial destitution should be forced to thumb his way back to Michigan, I am enclosing my personal check in the amount of \$1. This will help to defray the expense of sending him back home by the fastest available means—and at the earliest possible date.

I realize the amount of the check is rather insignificant, but I feel that it is all I can afford—with all my other numerous charitable contributions. I am sure, however, that the project can be oversubscribed several hundred times in Washington within the first couple of minutes.

Incidentally, I will accept any other contributions you want to send.

Then he says further:

It is possibly worthy of note (and perhaps should rate a special stamp to commemorate the achievement) that he has done what neither the Indians, road agents, bandits, nor the elements ever succeeded in doing during our entire history—disrupted the United States mail.

He is a Republican and he sent a check for \$1 made out to the "Summerfield Transportation Fund." Down in the corner where it says "For," he has "Homecoming."

I tried to get the gentleman from New Jersey to yield a while ago when he was reading off the postal rates charged in France, Russia, and every place else

around the globe, but he did not see fit to yield at that time, because I wanted to ask him a question as to whether or not France, Germany, and the rest of them carried Time and Life magazines free, or practically free. You hear a lot about the postal deficit. My good friend from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] comes in from time to time with a bill to raise postal rates. I have not yet voted for any of his bills because up to now he has not brought in one to raise the rates on the people who are causing the deficit. I do not have anything against Time or Life magazines, except the fact that they are not paying their way.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. How can you say we have not done anything to increase the second- and third-class rates?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Well, you have not brought them up to where they ought to be. You did bring in a bill to raise first-class rates by 33 percent.

Mr. MURRAY. And how much for second class?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Ten percent, I think it was, for second-class, was it not?

Mr. MURRAY. No, no.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Did the gentleman have any bill which would make these magazines pay their own way? Will the gentleman answer me Yes or No on that?

Mr. MURRAY. The bill provided for an increase of 10 percent on the reading matter contained in the magazines and 120 percent on the advertising content.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Would that have left any deficit?

Mr. MURRAY. It would have left considerable of a deficit.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is it, and that is the point I am trying to make. In other words, they would still be taking a partial free ride at the taxpayers' expense. I am only using Time and Life as an example. There are plenty of other magazines taking a free ride. If you would come in here with a bill to make those magazines pay their way and could show me that the Post Office Department still does not have enough money to operate without a deficit, I might then be willing to raise the rate on other classes of mail which are already paying their way. Until you do I am not going to vote for any postal increase. I do not think my mail has demonstrated that my constituents do not want a postal increase that is fair, but they do want the different classes of mail to pay their own way. If there is any business that is making a profit it is the slick paper magazines, and their financial statements show it.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, when the original Post Office appropriation measure was before the House, I voted against reducing the amount requested. I did this with full knowledge that always heretofore, the Congress had allowed the supplemental funds asked for, and that eventually the Congress could do nothing but reverse its stand.

In my opinion, Mr. Summerfield met the challenge of the committee and

House leaders in the only honorable and self-respecting manner open to him.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION
Loan authorizations

For an additional amount for loans for the rural-electrification program, \$200 million, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with section 3 (a) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, and to be made available from the loan authorization contained in section 606 (a) of the act of August 7, 1956 (Public Law 1020).

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language commencing on page 2, line 23, after the word, "as amended" and reading: "And to be made available from the loan authorization contained in section 606 (a) of the act of August 7, 1956 (Public Law 1020)."

Mr. Chairman, the public law referred to has nothing whatsoever to do with the authorization of REA, but is a loan authorization for construction of rural housing as provided in the Rural Housing Act of 1949, as amended by the act of 1956, which gives authorization to the Secretary of Agriculture to issue such debentures as necessary to carry out the authority contained in section 11 of the act of 1949.

I submit that this is legislation on an appropriation bill and is subject to a point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are seeking to make a record in this Congress in reducing the budget. There are two ways in which we can increase the budget: We can increase it by appropriating money in excess of the President's budget requests, or we can grant new obligatory authority through legislation directly affecting Government spending, but not through regular appropriation channels.

We asked President Eisenhower to tell us how we could reduce this big \$72 billion budget. We passed a resolution and sent it to him asking him how it might be reduced. The President, when he sent up his request here for \$200 million for loans for the REA, took into consideration that the money was needed, but he said we should provide this additional authorization by making these funds available from loan authorizations contained in section 606 of the act of August 7, 1956, which is the Rural Housing Act. Last year we passed a rural public-housing bill authorizing loans in the sum of \$450 million. We authorized loans in that sum. That showed in the budget as an additional obligation of the Government. It does show as an additional obligation of the Government to the extent of \$450 million. We would,

of course, hope and believe that the loans would eventually be repaid to the Government. So the President said: "We will not use all of this housing money. The law will expire in 1961 and we will not use half of it," as shown on page 40 of the hearings. He said that they would only use about \$27 million at this time and that one-half of the sum would never be used. He said this money would not be needed. So he proposed to transfer from the \$450 million in housing loan authority the sum of \$200 million for the REA. Through such a procedure the overall obligations of the Government would not be increased.

On the Department of Labor bill we worked for a week to reduce appropriations by \$130 million. Here, by reason of this point of order, we are proposing to increase the obligatory authority of the Government by \$200 million. I agree that in the labor bill a direct appropriation is involved and in this action obligatory authority of a different type is involved. In both cases funds can be taken from the Treasury. The housing funds and the REA funds will in time be repaid to the Government after a period of years when the loans come due. The point is in each case funds will be withdrawn from the Treasury and the obligatory authority of the Government is increased. The public debt will likewise be increased to the extent of the appropriations expended on the loans made. Of course, the Government will get credit when the loan money is repaid. If we increase the President's obligatory budget by \$200 million we will wipe out in a moment one-fifth of the savings we have made this year below the President's big budget.

Let us not increase the President's budget by \$200 million. Let us transfer this obligation from rural housing to the REA, all within the Department of Agriculture. Everyone agrees the \$200 million will not be used by the housing program. When the final chapter of this Congress is written the point of order will be responsible for a \$200 million increase in the President's budget in funds available for expenditure. This will make Congress look bad. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman from Texas is saying to the committee that the Appropriations Committee feels it has incurred the responsibility to legislate in the field of rural housing, which was passed by this Congress in 1949, and repeatedly included in every Housing Act up to 1956. Therefore, the question as to whether or not there should be a public debt transaction has to be decided by the Appropriations Committee.

It seems to me a very curious arrangement that the Appropriations Committee did not go further and enact legislation which would provide that the loans made by the Rural Electrification Administration should not be a public debt transaction—go the whole hog—instead of coming in here in such a way as to

preclude the authorizations and the work to be completed under the Farmers Home Administration. To carry out that program you commit one sin to protect the other sin you hope to commit in the future.

Mr. MAHON. I want to make it clear that I do not approve of the method being used by the President in requesting the \$200 million for the REA. I think the direct request should have been made by the Bureau of the Budget and that REA should stand on its own feet and that the housing program should stand on its merits. I do not want to see the REA or the housing program crippled, and if the administration would utilize the \$450 million housing authorization, I would be opposed to any transfer whatever. I do not like the transfer method. I am simply saying, however, that we have no other alternative except to increase the President's budget by \$200 million, and I would like to avoid that.

The gentleman from Alabama, if he insists upon this point of order, will be responsible for increasing the President's budget by \$200 million. I am not criticizing the gentleman from Alabama. I can see his position. He is a good legislator. Basically, I agree with his position. I am just trying to avoid increasing the President's budget by such a large sum.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I feel we ought to allow the language to stay in the bill as it stands.

Mr. MAHON. It was written by the budget and by the administration, not by the committee.

Mr. TABER. When the Department was up here it said that even if this year's expenses were doubled next year and maintained at that rate through 1961, this would only indicate a need for \$225 million for housing operations.

Mr. MAHON. The following is contained in the President's budget request to Congress, and it is contained in the bill which is before us:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION
Loan authorizations

For an additional amount for loans for the rural electrification program, \$200 million, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with section 3 (a) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, and to be made available from the loan authorization contained in section 606 (a) of the act of August 7, 1956 (Public Law 1020).

I now quote from a statement by Mr. Joseph C. Wheeler, director of the budget of the Department of Agriculture, whose testimony appears on pages 39 and 40 of the hearings before the Appropriations Committee:

Mr. WHEELER. House Document 115 includes proposed supplemental appropriations and other authorizations for various agencies of the Government, submitted to the Congress by the President on March 12, 1957. In accordance with budgetary policy, most of the additional appropriations and authorizations required for unforeseen and emergency items are proposed to be financed by transfers from obligational authority already

made available by the Congress. In transmitting the proposed supplemental appropriations to the President, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget stated as follows:

"In developing these recommendations the Bureau of the Budget has been guided by your statement in the 1958 budget message that 'efforts will continue to be made by every executive department and agency to improve efficiency and to maintain expenditures well within the budget estimates.'

"Requests for which tentative amounts were specifically forecast in the 1958 budget document have received the same strict review as other requests. Our objective has been to hold proposals for supplemental appropriations to a minimum, to require the absorption of additional needs within funds already available to the fullest extent possible and to search for offsetting savings."

In the case of the Department of Agriculture, requests totaling \$234,037,400 are included, of which \$229,037,400 are to be financed by transfer from other funds or authorizations already available. Included within these totals is an increase of \$200 million in the authorization for REA loans. A recent survey of borrowers' needs shows that applications for rural electrification loans will total about \$453 million in fiscal year 1957. At the time the budget estimates were prepared last fall, the latest survey figures available to the Rural Electrification Administration indicated that 1957 applications would total only about \$270 million. This proposed transfer of authorization would make it possible to meet this increased need for rural electrification loan funds in 1957 and provide a margin to continue the higher level loan program into 1958.

It is proposed to meet this need by transferring \$200 million of the \$450 million loan authorization for farm housing loans for the period 1957 through 1961, contained in section 606 (a) of the act of August 7, 1956. Based on experience so far this fiscal year in operating under the farm housing loan authorization, \$450 million is considerably in excess of what will be needed through 1961. Despite the fact that \$50 million was initially set up for use during this fiscal year, it now appears that not more than one-half that amount will be needed or used. Even if this year's experience were doubled next year and maintained at that rate through 1961, this would indicate a need for only \$225 million. Therefore, it was decided that the urgent need for additional electrification loans could be met in this manner without detriment to the farm housing program.

In summary, the proposal is in implementation of the determination stated on numerous occasions by the President to do everything possible to keep new obligational authority and expenditures within current budget totals and to meet unforeseen or emergency needs within existing authorizations.

The above-quoted statement from the budget director of the Department of Agriculture indicates that the transfer of obligational authority from the housing program to the rural-electrification program will do no injury to the housing program. If we follow the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, we will not increase the overall obligational authority of the Government. If the point of order is sustained, we increase the overall obligational authority of the Government in the sum of \$200 million, increasing the budget to that extent.

This Congress last year exceeded the President's budget in excess of \$1 billion by reason of these kinds of transactions, granting additional obligational authority, as is proposed here. So we worked so hard to make reductions, and why increase the budget by \$200 million

when the funds will not otherwise be used?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman's argument defeats itself. You say we are not going to use it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MASON. I object, Mr. Chairman. Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the entire paragraph on loan authorizations.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order that the part of the sentence that I raised the point of order against be sustained and not as to the entire paragraph. Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit that that point of order has not been disposed of and the Chair cannot entertain other points of order without disposing of the pending question before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand, the point of order was reserved.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes; it was reserved.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to be heard?

Mr. BOW. I desire to say this, Mr. Chairman: My point of order is in order at this time inasmuch as the gentleman reserved his, and the argument I would make against the entire paragraph is the same argument the gentleman made on his point of order to strike certain language. Where a point of order is raised to a portion of a paragraph, the entire paragraph is subject to a point of order, and I insist on my point of order.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I would like to be heard on the point of order made by the gentleman from Ohio.

The point of order which the gentleman from Ohio raises is to the entire paragraph. Now, there is no question as to the authority of the Committee on Appropriations to make appropriations available for the Rural Electrification Administration program. There is no restriction, nor is it a limitation, but it is a general authority by which the Committee on Appropriations would have authority to make appropriations.

Now, the point of order that I raise is to preclude the Committee on Appropriations writing into this bill legislation which is not authorized under pending law but taking the appropriation item and making it a credit against the Housing Act of 1949 and 1956 as amended. So, the argument made that this will increase the debt and at the same time that the Secretary of Agriculture will not utilize the moneys, is inconsistent to me, Mr. Chairman, and would not hold water. I do not think; nor would it be advisable any more than it would to take it out of funds available for the Atomic Energy Commission for some of its activities to carry on REA.

Mr. CANNON. I would like to ask if the gentleman insists on his point of order.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I insist on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

Mr. BOW. I insist on my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The point of order made by the gentleman from Alabama on line 23, page 2, is against the three lines beginning with the word "and" as being legislation upon an appropriation bill, which it obviously is.

Now, the gentleman from Ohio, however, offers a point of order against the entire paragraph. As the language which is sought to be stricken by the gentleman from Alabama is subject to a point of order and is part of the paragraph, then the whole paragraph is subject to a point of order, and the Chair is constrained to sustain both points of order.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARSHALL: On page 2, after line 17, insert:

"RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

"Loan authorizations

"For an additional amount for loans for the rural electrification program, \$200,000,000, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with section 3 (a) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended."

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to do that which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], who just spoke on the point of order, attempted to do. In other words, it restores language which your Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations wrote into the bill in the first instance. When we went before the full committee the other day, the full committee saw fit to write language in the bill which transferred from the rural housing program to the REA certain funds, \$200 million. Your Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations unanimously reported the language which is in the amendment which is now before us.

Your committee felt that the Rural Electrification Administration program should be kept entirely separate. We do know that some Members have heard from REA organizations throughout the country. They have been very insistent that they did not want their own authorizations tied up with other programs. I can rightly see why they take that stand, because it is poor practice for them to have their own authorizations affected by transfers from other programs. It does not make for a good, healthy feeling in the country when some of those things take place.

I think we ought to be careful when we do write legislation on an appropriation bill, because some of those things do have far-reaching effect. Some of the things that we do sometimes cause trouble and confusion, and, on top of that, they may do things that we do not intend to do. Certainly, as far as we are concerned, in going over appropriation bills we are doing what we can to stay within the budget. In fact, we are doing what we can to reduce the budget below the amount the President requested, the

largest peacetime budget in history. Appropriation bills are one thing, expenditures are another. I want to point out that this is an authorization, and it is an authorization for REA's to increase their borrowing power. This comes about because of the greater demand that REA has for its services and because of the demand that faces REA organizations to firm up their lines. No one anticipated when the Rural Electrification Act was passed that it would need the heavy power lines to carry the heavy loads that REA carries at the present time. Many of the REA organizations have been handicapped by not having proper construction to take place.

The loans are paid back. The repayment record of the REA is remarkably good. Because that repayment record is so good, this cannot be considered in one breath as an expenditure, because it is not an expenditure. They are loans that are paid back.

As far as this particular program is concerned I am sure that Members of Congress want to see REA's given the funds that they need to operate with. I am also sure that the legislative committees of this House do not want the Committee on Appropriations to write legislation on appropriation bills.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas. I should like to say to him that I appreciate his fine courtesy and I am sorry that on this matter there seems to be some misunderstanding that exists between the gentleman from Texas and myself.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I agree that the President would have followed a much sounder practice, in my judgment, had he sent up a budget estimate for \$200 million, carrying the additional obligatory authority of the Government. That is the way I think he ought to have done it. Then when we approved the \$200 million we would not be increasing the President's budget. But since there existed this obligatory authority, which is, according to the President, not needed, on the rural housing program, he took advantage of the opportunity to say we transfer that obligatory authority within the Department of Agriculture to the Rural Electrification Administration and we do not increase the overall obligatory authority of the Government. I do not like that way of doing it, but while I do not like it I would rather do that than increase the present budget by \$200 million. That hurts our economy record in Congress.

Mr. MARSHALL. I am sure my good friend from Texas agrees with me that under the parliamentary situation that exists at present my amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. MAHON. Sure, the gentleman's amendment ought to be adopted, but I should like for us to have gotten this \$200 million without increasing the President's budget. Of course, over a period of years this loan money will be paid back, but we all know that it is an outstanding obligation of the Government until it is loaned out and repaid.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, since our subcommittee refused to go along with the recommendation of the President to cancel Housing lending authority before we authorized REA lending authority, I should like to make the record clear as I see it.

I can appreciate the feelings of my friend from Texas as far as holding down the possible expenditures of the Government is concerned. I hope I have a good record in that regard, myself. Certainly it is my desire to hold down expenditures. But the President's recommendation was to the effect that we increase the lending authority of the REA to meet this need, which is sound. The money will be repaid with interest. But in the recommendation our subcommittee was asked to repeal 40 percent of the basic legislation on farm housing, including farm structures.

I have heard so much from so many of our friends in the House about the action of the Appropriations Committee on this course of passing legislation. In the first place, I did not know whether or not it was sound to repeal 40 percent of the Rural Housing Authority; but certainly I knew it was unsound for a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee to repeal 40 percent of the housing legislation that was law pure and simple, an act passed by the Congress and a part of the law of the land. It was not original action taken by our subcommittee we were asked to repeal. This was a recommendation that if we were going to give this lending authority to the REA, we were asked as an Appropriations subcommittee to repeal 40 percent of the basic legislation on housing. We just were not in shape to repeal this law, for this action was beyond our jurisdictional authority.

I am sorry my friend from Texas intimated in the committee, and has here, that our committee refused to go along in taking \$200 million out of the President's budget. If he had said: "Repeal the President's right to spend I would have agreed." We did not do as my friend indicated. We did not refuse to cut expenditures. We were not requested to do that. We were asked as an Appropriations subcommittee to repeal 40 percent of basic legislation on rural housing loans which was beyond our jurisdiction, beyond our reach. If, in a proper way, that matter is brought up for repeal I perhaps would vote for it, if we kept the other 60 percent. I do not know.

May I point out another thing: The President said the administration was not going to approve these loans for housing beyond the 60 percent which would have remained, which means the money would not have been spent. So the money is not going to be spent if the President holds the approvals down, as

he says he is. We have done as we tried to do before, stick to the rules of the game and tend to our own knitting. If you want to repeal the Housing Act, you do it. Our subcommittee said we could not because we were not authorized to. Unfortunately, the whole committee reversed us. That was their privilege. But I do think we ought to make the record straight here. At any rate, the President's recommendations went out on the point of order. Now there is nothing we can do except adopt the amendment and make these loans available to the REA. If some other group wishes in a proper way to repeal the Housing Act, you do it. It was beyond our reach.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 37, noes 40.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 55, noes 49.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER VI
Post Office Department
(Out of Postal Fund)
Operations

For an additional amount for "Operations," \$41 million.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARY: On page 5, line 7, strike out "\$41,000,000" and insert "\$19,000,000."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take up the time of the House any further. The Members have been very patient in listening to me. I think I have made a complete explanation of this item.

This amendment which I have offered will put into the bill the \$17 million recommended by our subcommittee, plus \$2 million, which was unquestionably within the exception of the antideficiency law. The total is \$19 million. The amendment gives the Congress the opportunity to vote specifically upon the question as to whether or not it wants to capitulate to the threats and tactics of the Postmaster General and its control over the expenditures of this Government.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we are not going to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] this afternoon. He would allow only \$17 million required to pay certain additional salaries under the Reclassification Act of last year. He would provide for no additional funds for the great increase in the volume of mail; for the hundreds and hundreds of extra carrier

routes that have to be provided. His amendment, in effect, would be a blow not only to the postal patrons of the United States but to the postal workers who have to serve us our mail.

Now, it has been made very clear these last few hours that the other body is ready to consider an appropriation of \$41 million and expedite such appropriation to the President of the United States.

Just a few moments ago there was some question about the action of the Post Office Department with reference to supplemental funds for the fiscal year 1957, dating back 9 months ago. I have just talked with the Bureau of the Budget here in Washington and I find that their records show that on July 12, 1956, the Bureau of the Budget advised the Post Office Department it was ready to entertain a supplemental for 1957 in the amount of \$30 million. Tack on to the \$30 million the \$17 million required under reclassification as mandated by the Congress of the United States and you have exactly the dollar figure now being requested by the Postmaster General, \$47 million. This supplemental was to be sent to the Senate for immediate consideration. The Senate suggested, however, it was too late and indicated that it be pursued in the early months of this year. That is exactly what the Postmaster General has been doing and in a very proper way.

I urge that we reject this amendment and stick to the \$41 million voted out by the Appropriations Committee by a vote of 37 to 10.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Can the gentleman give us assurance that if this amendment is defeated and the \$41 million provided, that the money-order service and service to the third-class mail and all other services now suspended will be resumed?

Mr. CANFIELD. That I truly believe.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I would like to congratulate the gentleman on the statement he has made, and I join with him in opposing this amendment.

Mr. CANFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. TABER. There has been no statement that the money is not needed to operate the essential services of the Post Office Department.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true, and the Department is very sensible and realistic in not spending or obligating funds it simply does not have.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take too much of the time of the Committee of the Whole in discussing this amendment. I do not think that is necessary. This amendment will and should be defeated.

This amount of \$41 million contained in line 7, page 5, was inserted in this bill when the amendment that I offered on Friday last in the full House Committee on Appropriations was adopted by the full committee by a vote of 37 to 10.

On Saturday and on yesterday in the city of New York there was great gloom as the result of the closing of the post offices. It seemed as though we were back in the war days again as the result of what has happened to the taxpayer and the postal employee in this pending hassle, which was caused either by the ignorance or the inability of the Postmaster General and/or the Director of the Budget. I believe the Comptroller General of the United States says they both violated the law.

On the facade of the general post office in Manhattan at 8th Avenue and 33d Street, in the city of New York, from whence is directed the activities, in the boroughs of Manhattan and the Bronx alone, of 30,000 postal employees, we find the following inscription:

Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds.

On yesterday in Brooklyn, N. Y., a collection was being taken up to defray the expense of adding after the words, "Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night," these two words "except Summerfield."

I know the House will reject the pending amendment and approve this amount of \$41 million and thus stop any further curtailment in postal service.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I support the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee for \$41 million for the Post Office Department. I feel that this is non-partisan, nonpolitical; and, certainly, politics regarding action of the Postmaster General in this matter should not be injected into it.

I know a little about the operation of the Post Office Department. I was with the Post Office Department for 11 years. I served with Generals Farley, Walker, and Hannegan and I have been on the Post Office Committee since January 1943.

I do not think the Postmaster General is due the unwarranted and unjust criticism that has been made of him today. Certainly he has done all he could to get this supplemental appropriation. He started last July telling the Bureau of the Budget that he had to have a supplemental appropriation. I cannot understand all this furor over this request. I regret the delay of the Bureau of the Budget in sending up the request for the supplemental appropriation but certainly the delay cannot be placed upon the Postmaster General.

As I have already said, the Post Office Department has been given supplemental appropriations for the last 10 years with the exception of 3 years when the present Postmaster General turned back substantial sums into the Treasury in 1953, 1954, and 1955 by not spending the full appropriations given him by Congress for these years.

The Post Office Department absolutely needs this money on which to operate during the rest of this quarter. You can either give the Post Office Department this money or you can expect drastic curtailment of your postal service from now until the first of July. The Postmaster General has no alternative.

All of you know that the mail volume increased considerably during the past year, that many expansions were made in the city carrier service and in rural route extensions. The volume of the mail demands for new city carrier routes exceeded the estimate of the Postmaster General when the budget was presented to Congress. Now the people are clamoring for good service. If you want good service, if you want to satisfy the patrons, and continue the efficient service of the Department, you will vote for this appropriation of \$41 million.

I do not agree that the Postmaster General is here trying to browbeat or sandbag the Congress. In my opinion he is doing the only thing possible in asking for the supplemental appropriation. He is telling us that he must have this money or that the service must be curtailed.

In my opinion, if you do not vote the Post Office Department the full \$41 million you will not only have your post offices closed every Saturday from now until the first of July, but you will also see many other drastic curtailments and reductions of the postal service. It must be so, because the Post Office Department just will not have the money to do otherwise if the appropriation of \$41 million is not made by Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there are certain salient facts that are outstanding in this matter. Whatever difficulty there is about the budget message coming up, it is the fault of somebody in the administration. It is either the fault of the Postmaster General, Mr. Summerfield, or the fault of the Director of the Budget. On the evidence submitted, I am inclined to think it is the Director of the Budget. We start out with the proposition that wherever the blame is, as far as the administration is concerned, it rests somewhere in the Republican administration and not with the Committee on Appropriations.

There are certain facts we must face from the practical angle. The Committee on Appropriations last Friday voted \$41 million. Everybody knew that was voted out of the committee and anyone with commonsense knows that is going through. Postmaster General Summerfield, in my opinion, was not only in contempt or showed a contemptuous attitude toward the Congress, but he also showed a contemptuous attitude toward the people of America when with the knowledge that the Committee on Appropriations had voted out \$41 million last Friday he did not rescind his order for last Saturday at least. All of us know the history of the antideficiency law; all of us are acquainted with that law and everyone knows there has never been any prosecution under it or any action taken under it. Postmaster Gen-

eral Summerfield knew that and with knowledge of what the committee had done last Friday he owed it to the American people to keep the post offices throughout the country open. If he had stated at that time, in rescinding his order for last Saturday, that if he did not get this money by next Saturday the order would stand, there might have been some logic in that action. But he did not do that. When the committee had acted, I cannot see why he did not then rescind his order.

Mr. Chairman, it so happens that I am majority leader of the House. Whether Postmaster General Summerfield consults with me or not is immaterial to me. Whether he has to might be a matter of discussion with some people. But it is the fact that so far as Speaker RAYBURN is concerned, he never saw the Postmaster General in connection with this matter until last Thursday, until after he had been doing all this talking through the press. I have not seen him. He has not even telephoned me. He would probably say he did not have to telephone me. But there is leadership up here. He has been up here consulting with the leadership of the Republican Party, and he should, but it seems to me as a matter of decency, if for no other reason, before he started talking and threatening through the press, and when the facts did not justify it, he should have come up here and talked with the leadership not on one side but with the leadership on both sides.

Let us push aside all of these things and get down to the real facts. To me the real issue here is the general public. What should we do in the interest of the general public? In the interest of the general public we should vote against the pending amendment that has been offered and vote for the \$41 million, get it through before we recess, and let the post offices of the country be opened during the remainder of this quarter.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think we should be carried away by alibis or excuses. The fact is Postmaster General Summerfield last July knew there was going to be a deficit and he so informed the Congress. The fact is that later on he renewed his plea that he needed this money if the service was to continue. The fact is that a week ago he was here and implored those who had charge of the appropriations in this House that he needed this money and that he could not continue unless given that money. The fact is he postponed that closing order for a week in the hope that the Congress would see clearly its duty to the American people and provide the money that would permit the postal service to go on as usual.

Last Friday it was stated by a high-ranking Member of Congress that he had violated the law about spending money outside the budget. That was untrue; he had not done so. Now, I ask in all fairness, if you were the Postmaster General, would you violate a law that he had already been falsely accused of violating? Of course you would not. To do that would be to put himself in a trap

that would be inexcusable. So I say to you, my friends, the Postmaster General is not to blame for this stopping of the mail no matter how many political protestations are made. We had a month to pass this appropriation bill in the House and we did not do it. I have been a Member of this House for a great many years. I have seen other bills in jeopardy, lacking a few hours of meeting payrolls. These went through this House by unanimous consent, because we recognized our obligation to the people who had earned the pay. True, no one before ever made any talk about the crime of exceeding the budget allowance. But here he was warned by members of the Appropriation Committee. One more thing I want to warn you of: There is a bill in conference, and has been in conference for a long while, and unless you get it out pretty soon, the social-security people of this country will be right where the postal employees are now. Let us not have another failure of Congress to meet its obligations. I say, let us be fair. Let us give the Postmaster General the funds which are necessary to carry the mails. The people want the service and expect us to do it. I do not believe by raising a smokescreen that we are going to keep the people from knowing where is the real responsibility for the failure of the mails to go through. The people of America are not dumb and they are not easily fooled. They can judge for themselves, and I know they will. Let us quit quibbling and vote down the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia and pass this appropriation bill today so the services that the people are clamoring for can be resumed. You can have service only to the extent you are willing to pay for it.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia. I want to take just a moment or two to point out the curtailment features of Postmaster General Summerfield's order.

I am surprised, yes, shocked that a member of the President's Cabinet would do what Postmaster General Summerfield has done. I am convinced that Summerfield's orders were not issued to actually obtain savings in the Post Office Department but were intended solely and simply to arouse the people into pressuring the Congress into appropriating additional money for the Post Office Department for the balance of this fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

The action of the Postmaster General is deceiving to the American people. It was not an effort to bring the expenditures of the Post Office Department

within the amount appropriated for the Department but rather it was intended to strike at the most important service of the Department that would be felt quicker by the people so as to get the desired reaction from them.

The orders prohibit the deliveries of RFD mail on Saturdays but it requires RFD carriers to put in full time on Saturdays with pay by sitting idly in their respective post offices. This deprived the RFD patrons of delivery of their Saturday's mail with no savings whatever to the Post Office Department except the small amount paid the carriers by way of mileage. This was plainly an effort to arouse the American people and to secure additional tax money for the Department. In my opinion, it amounts to extortion. It is an attempt on the part of Summerfield to hoodwink the American people into bludgeoning the Congress into giving the Post Office Department additional money to take the place of funds that have been unwisely and uneconomically spent heretofore by the Department contrary not only to the wishes of the Congress but the plain intent of the law.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to giving the Post Office Department any funds over and above the \$17 million recommended originally by the Post Office Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives. To do otherwise would be an admission on the part of the Congress that they do not have the power, the foresight, or the wisdom to legislate on matters of vital importance to the people of America. To refuse the Post Office Department this blood money that Summerfield is now requesting may cause some inconvenience to our people. Suppose it does? It is better for us to suffer some inconvenience now than to wreck the economy of this country by inefficiency and fiscal irresponsibility on the part of arrogant bureaucrats who are unwilling to even try to economize and put their departments on an efficiency basis.

It is estimated that the Secretary's orders prohibiting the rural carriers from delivering the Saturday's mail along their rural routes composing 1,582,800 miles will amount to only a savings of approximately \$142,000.

The so-called economy order in my opinion emanates from a fanatical desire to compel the Congress to yield to every whim and wish of an autocratic and dictatorial bureaucrat.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to giving the Post Office Department the funds that they are requesting, and I hope that our Congress, particularly this House, will see to it that we do the legislating, and that we do not yield on this occasion.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. In other words, the gentleman is saying that all of these men sat in the post office, got paid, but were not allowed to deliver the mail?

Mr. ABBITT. They were prohibited from delivering the mail. They required the rural carriers to go to the post office and sit inside, with the windows closed,

in most of the rural offices, but were prohibited from receiving or delivering the mail.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. If this House has the courage that the writers of the Constitution intended it to have, and that is not grounds for impeachment, then I do not know what is.

Mr. ABBITT. That is my information. And my information is that it is estimated that this would only save approximately \$142,000; yet the rural people of America were denied mail rural delivery.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] has expired. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this legislation resolves into a question of whether the House is willing to provide funds to pay the postal employees for their services and to provide the people of this country with mail service to which they are entitled.

The cause of the need for additional funds is by reason of postal services in additional areas and to an unprecedented volume of mail due to high business activity and increased cost resulting from postal employees' pay adjustments.

The impact of this need for additional funds was felt as long ago as last July. Most of the discussion revolved around the fact that a request for a deficiency appropriation should have been initiated when the first transfer of funds was made from the last quarter of this fiscal year to the first quarter of this fiscal year. This occurred last July. Requests for these funds were not submitted because the Bureau of the Budget did not clear them, which is required procedure.

Under the present circumstances, I believe that Congress must provide the additional funds. Certainly, we cannot afford to let our postal service deteriorate. Business plans have been made relying on existing postal service. I have done, and intend to do everything possible to see that these services continue.

Much has been said with regard to the so-called violation of law. There is no charge or inference that there has been misuse of funds. It is a question of misjudgment as to the need of additional funds to carry out an expanded program. In any event, the question before us today is whether the users of the mail are to have the services to which they have been accustomed and to which they are entitled and whether you want to appropriate sufficient funds to pay for this service and to pay the postal employees who perform that service.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, if you could picture a business doing \$2½ billion a year, employing 373,338 full-time employees and 135,000 part-time employees, maintaining 39,000 district offices, I am sure you would classify this investment as big, big business.

I am also sure the board of directors in debating their choice of a new president would very carefully weigh the qualifications of all prospective candidates for the position. Prime consideration in the selection would be given to a man's ability, knowledge, and experience in the business.

We in Government are running a business of this size for what I have described as the United States Post Offices.

Our Post Office was founded temporarily after the adoption of the Constitution in March of 1789. In 1829, the Postmaster General was made a member of the President's Cabinet by Andrew Jackson. In June of 1872, the Post Office Department became an executive department by an act of Congress. Our post-office system started with 75 post offices. Today, it is one of the largest businesses in the world.

Over the years the following motto was accepted by the postal employees as their incentive—"Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night, stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds."

A great pride has existed among the postal employees that they have never failed the motto under which they have worked.

For the first time since its inception, last weekend all post offices were closed.

The great record of services by the post offices was established by the postal employees.

These men through competitive examination had chosen the profession of a postal worker. As postal employees they took pride in seeing that the mail went through.

Their promotions in the Post Office were based on their ability, their experience, and by their standing in competitive tests.

In the previous administration under President Truman, the Postmaster General was a product of the post-office system.

He had the esprit de corps of the service.

He believed in the postal motto. Every promotion he received was because of his knowledge and experience in handling the mail. When the former Postmaster General was appointed, he measured up to all the qualifications needed to fill the position.

He was selected in the same way that the board of directors of a private corporation would select a man to be president of their company.

By no stretch of the imagination can the breakdown of the Post Office of the last weekend be blamed on those dedicated employees who are proud to be a part of our great post-office system.

This great blow dealt to the prestige of our Post Office can be placed at the door of only one man—the President of the United States.

Mr. Eisenhower would not consider carrying out the policy set by his predecessor by appointing one from the ranks and who had long experience in post-office work.

Although Postmaster General Donaldson was thoroughly experienced and had made a great record, the Eisenhower administration turned their back not

only on him but on the thousands of capable postal employees who knew thoroughly the workings of the Post Office, and made his selection under the spoils and patronage system.

The present administration chose the Postmaster General only on the following basis:

First, he was a Republican.

Second, he contributed to the Republican Party.

Third, he sold cars made by the General Motors Co.

Who among the members of the big business interests of Eisenhower's Cabinet would select a president of one of their holdings on the above basis?

Inefficiency and waste of money in the post-office system have been the result of this bad appointment.

Bungling by the administration, in the affairs of the Post Office, has resulted in breaking the morale of those who have spent all their lives as postal employees.

I have been told by many employees that the check and doublecheck and experimental changes suggested by the present Postmaster General have brought havoc and disorder to the regular procedure of the postal worker.

No wonder the Postmaster General is short \$47 million. The business administration the Postmaster General likes to speak about, if continued by him, will completely destroy our Post Office which we have all regarded with reverence over the years.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that drastic steps must be taken by Congress.

I have introduced a resolution requesting the President to ask for the resignation of the Postmaster General and to designate an experienced official—one who has been an employee of the Post Office Department to replace him.

This man must have the ability, experience and knowledge of the problems of the postal service, and be well qualified to discharge his duties.

I believe that after this appointment is made there should be a thorough investigation of our greatly enlarged Post Office services so that proper changes to keep abreast of the times may be made.

The best one qualified to do this job is one who has worked in the postal service; who has secured his promotion—not under the spoils and patronage system—but on his qualifications, ability and experience to do a good job.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6870) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be

agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I am, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 6870, to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 5, line 7, strike out the words "\$41,000,000" and insert "\$19,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARRISON of Virginia) there were—ayes 12, noes 121.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the Record on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

A SKIP-TRACING FIRM MASQUERADING AS UNCLE SAM

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, other Members have recently received from their constituents, as I have, official-looking forms from "Director in Charge,

NRC Office, 748 Washington Building, Washington, D. C." labeled "NRC Office—Notice," asking for information about the recipient's occupation, employer, birthdate, social security number, and correct address. The form also contains printed symbols and boxes obviously intended to make the notification look official and governmental.

A Milwaukee constituent who recently received one of these forms through the mail has passed it on to me, inquiring whether this was an official governmental form.

Members will be interested that the agency which sends out these forms throughout the country is in no way connected with the Government, but is a "skip-tracing" firm which has been in trouble with the Federal Trade Commission before. It supplies printed forms for companies wishing to trace and obtain personal information concerning debtors. The "NRC" stands, it turns out, for "National Research Co." But a visit to the NRC office in the Washington Building disclosed that the NRC is unequipped to do any particular "research." Instead, the only person in the place, Lansing Joralemon, the director in charge, admitted that "our business is skip-tracing."

The FTC on June 1, 1956, ordered the NRC to cease and desist from using any forms intended to convey the false impression that the business was connected with the United States Government. Since then the company has stopped using eagles and the words "United States," but uses the present form, which is equally deceptive. The company's attorney, Murray M. Chotiner, as recently as February 23, 1957, told the FTC that he was going to keep right on using the present forms.

The Federal Government plagues its citizens with enough forms and reports as it is, without letting Mr. Chotiner's skip-tracing bureau add to the workload.

This kind of petty deception is thousands of years old. Smooth Jacob impersonated hairy Esau by covering his hand with animal skin and attempted to fool his father despite his slick voice. In this case, Mr. Chotiner is attempting to dress the NRC in the clothes of Uncle Sam. The hand may be the hand of Uncle Sam, but the voice is the voice of Chotiner.

I am hopeful that the Federal Trade Commission will take prompt action. Debt collecting is a legitimate business, but not when the collector seeks to make Uncle Sam the collecting agency. I include my letter of April 12, 1957, to the FTC:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1957.
Re National Research Co. et al., Docket 6236.
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I urge your honorable body immediately to take the strongest possible action to enforce your order of June 1, 1956, which directed the National Research Co. to stop the distribution of any forms or questionnaires calculated to convey the false impression to the recipient that the company was in any manner connected with the United States Government.

Despite your cease-and-desist order of last June 1, the National Research Co. has continued to distribute misleading forms designed to pursue and entrap defaulting debtors. This outfit has masqueraded as a Government agency long enough. I suggest that the Department of Justice be asked immediately to institute a civil penalty suit against the company.

I am enclosing copies of two documents received through the mail on or about March 27, 1957, by Mrs. Betty M. Tiedt, 1010 West Orchard Street, Milwaukee, Wis. The original documents are in my possession and can be used as evidence in a suit against the company when needed. The documents are:

1. An IBM-type form headed "NRC Office, 748 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. Notice from 'Director in Charge, Lansing Joralemon,'" to Mrs. Tiedt. The form makes "immediate request" for information concerning her occupation, employer, birth date, social-security number, and correct address. It contains other mumbo-jumbo intended to make the notification look official and governmental.

2. A business reply envelope for returning the form addressed to "NRC Office, Director in Charge, Lansing Joralemon, 748 Washington Building, Washington 5, D. C."

Mrs. Tiedt filled out and dated the form March 27, 1957, and states that she received it not more than 1 or 2 days before that. Therefore this is clear evidence that the forms were distributed after your Commission by letter dated February 13, 1957, notified Mr. Murray M. Chotiner, attorney for the National Research Co., that the use of any forms that would not make the recipient aware that the information was sought in connection with the collection of a debt would be a violation of your order of June 1, 1956, and would result in a request to the Department of Justice to start a civil penalty action.

Your compliance division has informed me that Mr. Chotiner, who reportedly is not only the attorney for the National Research Co. but also a principal in the company, in a letter dated February 23, 1957, denied that there was deception in the form, denied that your order required the form to state that its purpose was to gain information about delinquent debtors, invited a test case and suggested that it be initiated in the Federal Court of Southern California, his home territory.

Let's have the lawsuit. The courts have upheld similar orders of your Commission in the past. Certainly they will not permit companies to badger citizens under the guise of nonexistent governmental connections.

I should like to quote from the letter of the Milwaukee attorney who forwarded on to me the documents received by Mrs. Tiedt:

"Enclosed is something that gets my dander up. I suspect this is a collection outfit creating the impression that it is a Government agency. It is a dirty shame that a citizen's desire to cooperate with the Government should be exploited by shysters. Ultimately, if this abuse spreads, people will not cooperate with Government requests for information."

Your Commission by its order of June 1, 1956, did succeed in stopping the National Research Co. from using even more flagrantly fraudulent forms containing pictures of eagles and other symbols and phony titles to convey the impression of Government affiliation. The new form is an obvious attempt to sneak around the Commission's order. Until such forms or questionnaires state their true purpose on their face, making clear that they are not from a Government agency, their use should not be permitted.

I am sure that the Commission recognizes the dangers to the public interest and to the good name of the Government that are inherent in this kind of masquerading operation. I look forward to hearing from you

that strong steps are being taken to stop this deceitful practice.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

FAIR PLAY IN CONGRESSIONAL BUSINESS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I have had called to my attention a story which appeared in the noon edition of the Washington Daily News of April 12, 1957, which story referred in detail to a number of allegations of misconduct of military personnel in Alaska, including several high-ranking officers of the Air Force. These allegations were reportedly contained in a letter addressed to me and signed by a "Keith Hart," who gave his address as College, Alaska.

Substantially the same story has appeared in local newspapers and in wire service stories given wide dissemination.

I am concerned about the only impression that can be drawn by the average reader from the Daily News version, and one or two others—and that is that the letter was made public or available to the press by my office or by the staff of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. That impression is inaccurate—I did not release the letter to the press. The facts are these:

First. The original of the Hart letter was addressed to me and delivered to my office on April 10, 1957; the original letter I received indicated on its last page that carbon copies had gone to at least 14 other people, a number of them here in Washington. Upon receipt of the letter I contacted the appropriate officials in the Defense Department and asked that I be given an early reply to the allegations.

Second. In light of the appearance of the story in the Washington Daily News, I can only conclude that one or more of the recipients of carbon copies of the Hart letter, the original of which was addressed to me, made known the contents to the Daily News reporter, and apparently to other members of the press—all without contacting me before taking that action.

I repeat, that until the appearance of the story in the Daily News, as I believe is the only proper treatment of such matter, the contents of the Hart letter were in no way made public by me, or by my committee or office staff.

Third. I want this much to be made unmistakably clear:

I have always believed that anyone accused—whether in or out of Government, or in or out of uniform, whether appearing before a congressional committee, or in connection with some business of the Congress or a committee—should have an opportunity to be confronted with allegations made against him, and be afforded the right to tell his side of the story before those allegations are made public.

Fourth. We on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have in the past—as have all Members and committees—received anonymous, or signed allegations of misconduct in some field or other. This has been true during the past 18 months in connection with an inquiry by my committee into military public land use, including hunting and fishing practices within military reservations. A number of allegations have been made, covering a wide range of subjects and geographic areas, and from a number of quarters.

Because the Hart letter was signed, was specific in several instances, and because it did contain very serious allegations of misconduct by personnel under the jurisdiction of the Air Force in Alaska, I followed what I considered to be the only proper procedure in such matters. The basic tenet of what I consider "proper procedure" is confrontation and an opportunity to rebut, if possible, allegations made, before any publication of the allegations.

Fifth. I regret very much that others did not elect to follow that procedure in this instance. Until official explanation and comment is received from responsible defense sources, no additional steps will be taken by me in the matter. When such explanation and comment is received, I will of course then consider what further action should be taken.

CONTROL OF NARCOTIC DRUGS

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation in the House of Representatives to establish a comprehensive and fair control system covering the manufacture of all narcotic drugs, not only the natural narcotic drugs made from imported crude opium and coca leaves, but also the newly developed synthetic drugs that are now being made from a vast variety of uncontrolled sources readily available within the United States.

A striking example of the need for such legislation appeared in papers a few days ago when they reported of the development of a new painkiller which acts more quickly than the centuries-old morphine. If this new drug, now known only as Su4027, should prove addictive, like many of the other synthetic analgesics, the quantity and locations of its manufacture must, of course, be controlled and limited to legitimate medical and scientific purposes. But under existing law the Government has no power to control the manufacture of such drugs.

A practical control over the manufacture of natural narcotics, which can be manufactured only from crude opium and coca leaves not grown in the United States, has been achieved in the past by limiting the amounts of importation of crude opium and coca leaves under the Export and Import Act. But no such control is available over the

manufacture of synthetic drugs that can be produced from available domestic sources.

The Harrison Act has been generally effective to control the distribution and use of narcotic drugs in interstate commerce. But with the development of the new synthetic drugs control over distribution and use without control of the manufacturing source is no longer adequate. An effective system of control requires, among other measures, restriction of the total production of all narcotic drugs to the amount required for medicinal and other proper uses. Any excess tends to find its way into illicit traffic and use, despite controls on distribution and sale.

The new legislation is needed not only for general health and welfare purposes; it is also required to enable the United States Government to discharge its treaty obligations which require it to limit the manufacture in the United States of new synthetic narcotic drugs, as well as the natural narcotic drugs, to quantities required for legitimate medical and scientific needs and to manufacturers who have been licensed for the purpose.

Modern chemical research is constantly producing additional new synthetic drugs; and patents on already developed synthetic drugs, which have restricted their manufacture to the original manufacturer, are beginning to run out. The need for control has become urgent.

Enactment of control legislation has been repeatedly urged by the Commissioner of Narcotics and has been advocated by the President's Special Committee to Combat Illegal Narcotics. Near the close of the last session of Congress, I introduced legislation for this purpose, but the bill could not be considered before the Congress adjourned.

The present bill is a revised and improved version of last year's measure. I believe both its purposes and provisions deserve and will receive the support of the medical profession, the ethical drug industry, the public, and the Congress.

ECONOMIC DISCRIMINATION

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, progress is not without its drawbacks.

As medical science increases the span of human life, our industrial civilization shortens the ceiling beyond which it will not hire workers.

A person seeking employment may be healthy, sober, industrious, and with an excellent work record, but if he admits to being more than 40, he becomes aware of a sudden lack of interest on the part of the personnel officer. The job opening immediately closes. And he is left on the outside.

There are numerous violations of the Fair Employment Practices Act.

Discrimination against job applicants who are not old, but simply approaching middleage, is widespread.

A survey of the larger cities reveals that more than 40 percent of all employment offers are limited to applicants who can prove that they are under the age of 45.

This points up one of the tragic social problems of our time; the exclusion from our industrial life of so many competent and conscientious workers who are from 40 to 65 years of age.

This applies with particular severity to the worker who has given 20 or more years to the same job in the same industry. When that industry curtails its operations, or moves to some other section of the country, the displaced worker is unable to find other employment.

Some employers are blunt about it. "Over 40? Sorry, no job."

Others are more subtle, deceiving the applicant with the hope that "we have a long list ahead of you, but if we reach your name we will let you know. In the meantime, we will place your application on file."

The dead file.

If employers try to rationalize this on the grounds of "efficiency," and I dispute this because middle-aged workers are more experienced and responsible, then a ruthless factor is corrupting our vaunted material progress.

As I see it, there is a conspiracy of silence concerning this problem. We must bring it out into the light of day, examine it, and devise remedies for it.

That is the basic purpose of congressional investigations.

It is my belief that increased pension and insurance costs are the root of this discrimination against people over 40 who are looking for work.

In the emphasis on speed-up in our industrial system, and the subordination of an individual's worth to an actuarial table, are we going to say to people in the prime of life: "You are through at 40. You do not belong. It is no business of ours how you manage to survive until you are 65, and then hang on to the life-preserver of social security that is barely able to keep you afloat. Business is business, and we have got to be realistic about it. So sorry. The door is closed to you."

If industry as a whole, has no better answer than that, with its new power and responsibility in our national life, Government will have to step in and fill the vacuum.

We cannot afford to condemn people over 40 to economic exile. Furthermore, they will not stand for it.

To get at the source of this serious, and neglected problem, I propose that the Committee on Education and Labor shall undertake a full-scale investigation into the job barriers set up against people over 40 who are willing and anxious to work.

This is economic discrimination at its worst.

I suggest that we take steps to correct it, before it leads to further deterioration in the right to work, and in the morale of Americans over 40.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, one modern tank costs around \$200,000, and hundreds of these are required as an integral part of our national defense. It is, therefore, important that we in the Congress who have the responsibility for providing the money for these tanks understand the progress that is being made in their development for tactical use in battle. I doubt if many of the Members of this House have had the opportunity to inspect our latest tank models or see them in action. Recognizing this, last December the Department of the Army started preparing for a demonstration at the Armored Center at Fort Knox, Ky., to which would be invited Members of the House and Senate and other Government officials responsible for national defense. As an exercise of this kind would involve the participation of many different units, it was necessary to set the date several months in advance, and the dates selected were May 3 and 4.

I learned of the demonstration on March 19, and on that day called the attention of the officials of the Department of the Army to the fact that the Kentucky Derby was being run in Louisville, 30 miles from Fort Knox, on the afternoon of May 4, and as the demonstration was scheduled to end at noon on that day it was possible that some Members of Congress would want to stay over a few hours for the derby. I pointed out the possibility of a misunderstanding about tickets and suggested it be made clear that the Army would not undertake to secure tickets or make arrangements for the derby, and this was done in the notice which went out to Members of Congress.

As I represent the Louisville, Ky., District I felt an obligation to assist my colleagues who wanted to attend the Derby in securing tickets. I thereupon made an investigation and found that only 4 or 5 of the 50 or more who were going to the demonstration were interested in staying over for the Derby and suggested to the Department of the Army that the small number would not justify holding a plane and we probably would return to Washington by commercial airline. I want to make it clear that to my personal knowledge the officials of the Department of the Army did not have the Kentucky Derby in mind when the arrangements for the Fort Knox demonstration were made and their first knowledge of the coincidence of dates of the two events came when I called it to their attention on March 19.

So you will see the actual facts do not support the charges that were made in the press and on the floor of this House that the Army had arranged a congressional junket to the Kentucky Derby. As the result of these baseless charges, cer-

tain individuals in the Department of the Army were unjustly accused and that fine service was presented in a very unfavorable light to the country.

Perhaps the most important legislation we consider in this Congress relates to national defense, and all of us should make every reasonable effort to thoroughly inform ourselves on the subject. The Army, Navy, and Air Corps have gone to a lot of trouble from time to time to show us what progress is being made in the development of new weapons and tactics. I for one have benefited greatly from these demonstrations and feel that I am a better Member of Congress because of the knowledge of our defense preparations which has been made available to me. At this time I want to express my deep appreciation for the invitations that were extended me to visit Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Fort Bragg, the Brooklyn Navy Yard, Norfolk Navy Yard, Nevada Proving Grounds, Eglin Field, Fort Knox, and Fort Benning.

Perhaps those who helped to expose the so-called congressional junket to the Kentucky Derby felt they had rendered the country a real service and saved the taxpayers money when the Fort Knox demonstration was called off, but an examination of the facts will clearly show all they did was to unjustly smear innocent persons who were sincere in their efforts to inform Congress on an important aspect of national defense. They also denied Members of Congress the opportunity to see for themselves the high degree of proficiency the armored center of the United States has achieved at Fort Knox under the command of Maj. Gen. Jack L. Ryan.

PASSOVER MESSAGE TO ISRAEL

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it has been 35 centuries since the exodus of the Jews from the oppression of Egypt. And after 35 centuries the heart and the mind of Egypt are untouched by the sentiments of peoples elsewhere in the world of everbroadening horizons. Today, as 35 centuries ago, the Jew finds in Egypt only oppression, and the ships of commerce of the great and courageous State of Israel are barred by the Government of Egypt from passage through the Suez Canal.

It is fitting that today we in the Congress of the United States, in joining in the celebration of the Passover, the Hebrew spring festival, should give assurance of our support and our warmest friendship to the Government and the people of the State of Israel.

The Passover festival is one of the earliest religious and national landmarks in the history of the Jews. It has always been regarded as the festival of freedom. Its origin goes back to the exodus of the Jews from Egypt in about the 15th century before our era. The cause of

this exodus was general oppression, one aspect of which was apparently a refusal of the Government to permit a general gathering for the old custom of sacrificing the firstlings of their flocks in the spring. Later the sprinkling of the blood, and the ritual of the unleavened bread were combined, culminating in the Passover festival. Moreover, this festival was made the fitting occasion for a celebration in memory of the redemption of the Jews from Egypt. Subsequent dispersion of the Jews and the oppression amplified the meaning of this festival. With the "Passover of Egypt" was associated the idea of the "Passover of the future," the hope for Israel's redemption from exile.

Today, some 2,000 years after their dispersion, it is indeed great joy to see the people of Israel celebrate their historic spring festival in their ancestral home, in their recreated and reborn State of Israel. Through the years of dispersion it seems that the true meaning of this ancient festival was never lost; in it the freedom-loving Hebrews perceived the great benevolent acts of their God. Today while they celebrate the Passover in joy and freedom, justifiably and steadfastly they cling to that sublime divine belief.

In the making and shaping of the State of Israel this belief has worked as the spiritual catalytic force; and it seems that the vigor of youth as well as this belief have played equally important parts in the making of that State a safe and happy haven for the Jews. Under the existing circumstances the new state is in dire need of economic assistance. Her trade with the West has been improving and is still expanding. The country is being industrialized and progressively developed. With the political and moral support of the West, it is fast becoming a model democracy in the Middle East. Yes, the spirit of the "Passover of the future" has been realized. And even in the celebration of this memorable national festival the people of the State of Israel are readied for the firm maintenance of their hard-won and richly deserved freedom and independence.

TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE—FOUNDER'S DAY PROGRAM

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, following is an address which I made at the Tuskegee Institute, Founder's Day program, on Sunday, April 14, 1957:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE FRANCES P. BOLTON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE OHIO 22D DISTRICT, AT TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE, FOUNDER'S DAY PROGRAM, SUNDAY, APRIL 14, 1957

Mr. President, honored guests, members of the Strong Band of Tuskegee Alumni, and students, Founder's Day is always a peculiarly poignant day here at Tuskegee. The man whose memory we honor, brought to his own people opportunity and hope—to

his country a practical answer to many problems and a new vision of America's responsibility in the field of human relations. Much has happened since his day—some of it almost miraculously good, some of it not so good. Alas, that change always stirs up the best and the worst in people. Not so strange, perhaps, that the death struggle of any outworn way of life is fierce and terrible. Yet we know that Lincoln's words: "I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave, half free" hold true in a deeper sense today for they say to us: Freedom and justice are for all men, not for any one race or color or religion nor for any way of life. If one could wave a magic wand and take away in an instant the fears, the prejudices, the old habits of centuries, how wonderful it would be. But man learns slowly. So we see the moderation in the Supreme Court's decision set aside—and prejudice and fear, bitterness and hate, build up continuing misunderstanding.

But even these will pass as bits of flotsam and jetsam on the great river of God's life upon our earth—thrown about among the rocks of narrow canyons for a time—but ultimately reaching the calm and the unity of the eternal sea.

Though I have been able to come to Founders Day only a few times, the memory of the few stays with me. Today you have given me an added privilege in asking me to speak to you. I hesitate to do so, for such very eminent people have preceded me. Yet am I deeply happy to come to you. Somehow I seem to leave my inhibitions at the gate when I come to Tuskegee—and both my mind and heart feel free to speak without restraint.

My association with your presidents, your board, your faculty, mean very much to me. I never come without learning something. I always go back to Washington refreshed. For all this I am grateful, but never more so than today.

We are living in what is perhaps the most momentous day of all man's life on earth. As one reads history, one finds great changes occurring periodically—but never before has all the world been involved at one time. One by one the secrets of fire, of light, of propulsion, of radiation, of communication and transportation have been opened to us. We have stepped across a threshold which opens the deep secrets of creation and its sister—destruction. Our very existence is in jeopardy, perhaps the existence of our world. How will man use these new found elements? Upon his understanding of the law, upon his recognition of the fact that "the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof" (not man's world) will it all depend.

Evidences of the new world that is being built are on every hand—but none more dramatic, more vital than that which occurred on the midnight preceding March, the 6, 1957, far away in Africa.

For many years there had been a British Colony known as the Gold Coast—a name that told of wealth, of seafaring men who found riches. As March the 6th took over, a new nation was born—returning to the name of Ghana, an ancient West African empire which flourished about a thousand years ago. Even after it passed from the scene of history its legend spoke of power and magnificence in bygone days. Yes, a new nation was born, an ancient nation reborn.

The special significance of a nation's rebirth tends to be overshadowed by the rounded oratorical phrases of the day. We have begun to speak in clichés, to think in patterns: colonialism and independence, empire and freedom. But phrases are not enough. There are moments when the breath of ancient tradition can be felt in the present, and events are touched by the

long shadows of past realities that go back as far as 10 centuries. Such a moment came at that midnight hour.

Perhaps you have seen TV portrayals of the scene, but I can assure you they could not do it justice.

Let me try to bring some reality into the picture.

The Gold Coast Assembly meeting the night of March 5 was dignified and a bit solemn. Restraint was in every word and upon every face. But when the Speaker, Sir Emmanuel Quist, solemnly announced its adjournment, a spark of deep emotion flashed through Parliament house. Cheers mingled with tears in the galleries and on the floor. The long-awaited moment had come.

Outside the jubilant voices of massed thousands could be heard in a rising crescendo as the Speaker's words carried over the public address system. Amidst exploding firecrackers and triumphal shouts, the Prime Minister was swept on friendly shoulders to a raised platform on the nearby polo field. There, he did a brief dance of jubilation, stepped to the microphone, and delivered his freedom address.

The Prime Minister's power over the masses was apparent. He is a gifted orator who fires one explosive statement, then waits for it to sink in and the avalanche of roars to subside before he shoots another. Were he not so serious and the circumstances underlying the hysterical happiness of the crowd less grave, his technique might seem that of a rabble rouser. Kleig lights shone down on the scene of upturned faces as they sang a national political song while cameramen from the United States and British Information Service, as well as CBS filmed the scene. Their shouts of joy were indescribable when they heard their leader declare, "At long last we are free."

But Nkrumah did not make the event one of jubilation only. He told them their task had only just begun. He warned of sacrifices. He told of the responsibilities they, the people, must now shoulder. He charged them to prove themselves worthy of freedom and self-government.

The crowd itself was an experience. Filled with emotion as it was there no pushing or shoving, only a deep down joyous good nature. When all was over the whole vast smiling assemblage melted away into the night.

The next morning the new Parliament was convened with great pomp and ceremony in the name of the Queen by the Duchess of Kent, and Ghana turned a new page in her proud history.

Africa, the oldest of earth's continents geologically, has a history long since buried in her past. The relentless seas left her few harbors. Man's heedless destruction of her forests left her with high plateaus from which all life-bearing soil had been blown away. Ignorance and climate—man's great enemies—had built up barriers of sickness of every sort and kind between her people and the outside world. Indeed her West Coast has often been called the white man's grave.

So the Western World has known little of Africa, and cared less except where hardy adventurers found wealth in gold nuggets, in cocoa, in palm oil, etc., and in the enslavement of her people. But evolution moves relentlessly on and little by little, one at a time, the African nations will insist upon taking the responsibility for their own lives.

Is this going to affect us here in the Western Hemisphere? Have we any responsibility to the people of these emerging countries?

Is it not possible that we, here in this young country of ours, are learning lessons in human relationships which might be useful to the people in the various countries of Africa and throughout the world, especially those whose people are of various races? Here in these United States we are still trying

to find our way out of the jungles of prejudice, ignorance, and injustice. I would suggest to you that the peace of the world may hang upon the method we here in America employ to bring understanding and complete justice to all men within our own frontiers. To right a wrong that has gone so deep is tragically difficult, for it requires the kind of patience that only an unshakable faith in a just and understanding God can give. I do not speak of a do-nothing patience. I speak of a patience so permeated by wisdom and by love that it knows when to speak quietly, when to shout aloud, when to move and in what direction and when to wait. Surely a milestone was reached when at last a President, President Eisenhower, within weeks of his first inauguration, removed the visible barriers as he had said he would wherever Presidential power could reach. Unfortunately invisible barriers in the hearts of men will disappear less readily.

We mortals have no way of knowing the ways of evolution. Yet, is it not possible that even the enslavement and transplanting of the descendants of an ancient land had and have deep meaning? For not only did Africans find themselves on the continent of North America, but also in South America and in the islands.

These ancient cultural traditions transplanted to the Western Hemisphere will—I am firmly convinced—form a most significant basis for mutual understanding in the future of modern Ghana. True, political and economic factors are of vital importance. But upon more than this new nation's form of government or her national resources will her stability and orderly processes depend. Her foundations rest upon a more elusive and far less calculable set of conditions. They rest upon her soul.

Were you to ask me what I mean by a nation's soul I should have to begin by saying that essentially a nation's soul is the sum total of all its experiences; its religious-cultural heritage; its emotional qualities, and its ability to face the challenges of the events within and all around it. In our day and age of psychological studies, we often speak of personality characteristics. A nation has these no less than does a person. Even a continent may have a soul and/or a personality. To me Africa has such a personality—strong and emotionally powerful, yet appealingly tender, so potent that all who tread upon her shores are in a measure changed. I have no doubt that it was just this soul of Africa that Prime Minister Kwame Nkrumah had in mind when he called for an African personality in international affairs and said that Africans "must seek an African solution to the problems of Africa."

We of the West have a challenge to meet in this for we are always too apt to feel that our solution of our problems, our way of life, is best for all people. It is high time that we went out to see the world, not with closed minds arrogantly pleased with ourselves but with all our senses open to absorb the thoughts, the feelings, and the realities of other lands and other peoples. It is also high time that we faced up to the cold fact that we have not done too well in certain aspects of our own living, and that our actions, watched across the world, affect our standing and the quality of our leadership in the family of nations.

I believe that you who carry in your veins the blood of Africa will want to find your particular niche in the help our country can give to Ghana and to other emerging countries. Your instinctive understanding of the thoughts and emotions of our African neighbors should be of infinite value. Yet curiously enough, you will perhaps need to use greater restraint than those of us whose traditions come from other strains. It would be so easy to overlook the differences of your experiences and so fail to understand the

possible suspicion with which your overtures might be regarded.

The world is so conditioned to suspicion by centuries of exploitation of the weak by the strong that our desire to share our good things without demanding returns is mistrusted still. Our American assumption of superiority all too often raises a barrier that is difficult to break down. Let me repeat Prime Minister Nkrumah's words: "Africans must seek an African solution to the problems of Africa"—not a British one, not a Russian nor a Chinese one, not an American one, but an African one.

Africa knows her own soul better than any outsider, no matter how well-meaning. It is at this point that colonialism fails—for with the best intentions in the world the enigma of Africa's soul defies outside comprehension. It is to England's glory that American-educated Premier Nkrumah could say "we part from the former imperial power, Great Britain, with the warmest feelings of friendship and good will." After these centuries of colonial control, at this solemn moment of independence one feels that, consciously or subconsciously, every Ghanaian is singing his own poem of gratitude so well voiced by the poet Henley:

"Out of the night that covered me,
Black as the pit from pole to pole,
I thank whatever gods may be—
For my unconquerable soul."

One cannot but recognize, however, the fact that a colonial power can do much to better the physical condition of a territory. It can establish transportation and communication; it can wipe out malaria and other decimating diseases; it can bring the resources of a nation into the world market, so increasing prosperity. Today's colonial powers are doing these things in no uncertain ways—clean water, sewage disposal, medical services are perhaps the best examples of colonial beneficence. The results are dramatic. Mr. Charles T. O. King, once Liberia's Ambassador to the United States, commenting recently upon certain advantages enjoyed by a nation such as Ghana which has passed through the period of colonialism and benefited from these constructive services said: "It is the difference between the home of a man who has accomplished everything by his own sweat and toil, and that of a man who has enjoyed a large inheritance."

And Ambassador King spoke feelingly—for his country of Liberia has had to work out her own salvation. But there is no question as to what the Liberians feel: Freedom is first—better living can and will be built through too slowly for the impatient ones.

Ghana on the other hand has had every advantage while Liberia has walked the road of sweat and toil. Yet one must know that the development that has taken place in Ghana during these last years has been largely the work of her own people, helped along by the country's continued tranquility, the absence of irresponsible agitation, and an atmosphere of constructive achievement.

No conqueror ever subdued the soul of the nation he came to control. How dramatically this has recently been proven in Hungary. Dr. Nkrumah defined very well some of the conditions likely to influence and govern the future of Ghana and much of Africa as a whole. Africa's personality—her soul—has been and will remain her own. She is no more likely to yield her soul to the blandishments of communism, imported from the Soviet Union than she ever yielded it to other non-Africa influences.

It is interesting to see that Communist materialists have proven particularly unimaginative in their dealings with Africa—at least in the past. Certainly nothing could be more alien to Africa's personality than the mechanistic approaches of Marxism—

what it chooses to call its "scientific determinism." But their methods need watching, for they are consummately skillful in changing their methods to meet new situations. Yet—somehow—I have too great a faith in the people of Africa to be disheartened by the tremendous upstepping of the U. S. S. R. program for Africa.

Yes, I spent 3 months south and east of the Sahara a short while ago, traveling some 20,000 miles and stopping in 24 countries. I am no authority on Africa. As I look back upon those days in commercial aircraft, on trains, riverboats, coastwise freighters, cars, and jeeps, I find certain things have grown increasingly clear. Perhaps my thoughts did not actually crystallize fully until that moment when the flag of Ghana—red, yellow, and green, with a strong black star at its heart, spread its wings for the first time over a free land. To me it said to all the world: Africa will and must be her own master.

What a task. Surely the greatest task of all for a man or a nation is to be master of his own soul. To come to maturity, to shoulder the responsibility of adulthood, psychologists tell us, tests the very fiber of one's being.

So too the task of responsibility tests the fiber of a nation—of our own as well as that of the youngest and the oldest on this earth. Ghana finds herself in a privileged position. It was, in a manner of speaking, full grown at birth. A thousand years of tradition have given her inner strength to be herself. Ghana has been reborn in the shadow of ancient glory, master of her destiny, proudly conscious of her unconquerable soul.

May the Infinite have her always in His gracious keeping.

We Americans are in a position to be of inestimable service to all the developing countries of the world. We could and should be filling the vacuum in their lives. For they are searching day and night to fill the emptiness that has become theirs. You may well ask what is this vacuum? Let me give you the words of Charles Malik, long Lebanon's representative in Washington:

"In the case of many of them, the vacuum is something far above mere personal needs. . . . It is something to live for, some idea to serve, some cause to be dedicated to."

When Dr. Malik was asked (by U. S. News & World Report), "What is the particular appeal of communism as an ideology to the intellectuals of the Middle East?" he replied, "Its social vision, its total character, its total interpretation of life—its Messianic idea, namely that it is the wave of the future. Also the promises it holds—that it will solve all these economic and social injustices. It is these things, you see, it's these things."

And it is something more: It is the complete dedication and the fanatic zeal of the Communist that draws people to him. Even the most critical anti-Communist cannot but be impressed when he encounters the truly dedicated Communist. He is often left with a curious sense that there is a certain flabbiness and softness and inconsistency in our western way of life which is less than impressive to the man who is searching for a completely satisfying way. Because of the dedication of the Communist worker and the consummate skill of world communism, we of the West find ourselves outdone all too often. Again let me quote Dr. Malik:

"Communism is a very strange thing: It's a total impact; it comes to a man from every angle—from the social challenges of his country, the economic challenges, the political challenges, even the intellectual challenges when he has nothing he really believes in and his teachers themselves don't believe in anything much."

Because Dr. Malik—a graduate of the American University of Beirut—loves this

great land of ours second only to his own we shall do well to listen to him when he pictures the contribution he feels we can and should make. I quote him:

"You have in your own traditions certain invaluable beliefs about man and society, and history and human destiny, and the nature of God—beliefs you should not be ashamed of, that you should feel free to export and to teach others. But first you must rediscover them yourselves and believe in them profoundly. Many of you have taken life too much for granted. Therefore the great deposit of belief and conviction and interpretation of life which has come down to you, you simply don't honor enough."

"The Communist is a man who has received a tradition and honors it profoundly and believes in it and, therefore, is willing to propagate it. You are a bit diffident—and many of you don't really know your own traditions."

"My deepest fear," says this man who knows us so well and loves us so dearly, "is that you don't know the infinite values that you have at the basis of your own civilization and that you don't believe in them enough to put them strongly to the rest of the world. You take life too easily. You take things too much for granted. You are not fighting for your values as much as your forbears were."

Dr. Malik was speaking of what he knows to be the point of view of the Middle East. My journeys have given me a deep sense of the rightness, the accuracy of his diagnosis and the application to all our world contacts.

Look at the world as a whole with some three-quarters of its people of some color other than white. Everywhere there is this longing for an understanding of life itself and more participation in it. The upsurge of what has been termed nationalism is but one phase of this demand of every human creature to know that he, the individual, has importance. He needs something firm to stand on, something strong to tie to. Surely it is this that is America. Fundamentally, basically, American stands for an all-consuming certainty that because God is, we are. Quite regardless of the fact that we still walk in the shadows of our own misdeeds deep in our souls we believe that every human creature is made out of the very essence of the Being of Deity and because he is, he as an individual has a primal importance that must and will be recognized.

No one has understood these fundamental human needs more truly, more constructively than this great man whose vision and consecrated work conceived and brought into being this great institution. The man whose impress is upon so many, whose memory is poignantly with us today. He had no diffidence when it came to the contribution he felt his people were qualified to give to his country. We who carry on in his stead, trying to keep abreast of the needs this place must fill, are privileged indeed. Tuskegee's name is one revered in many areas of the world, most of all, perhaps in Africa. I find myself so very often wishing that there might be a replica of this great institution somewhere in the central areas of that great continent, the continent that God has been holding in reserve, the continent from which will come new revelations of His wisdom, His justice and His love.

Gathered here as we are today let us ask the Author of Life, the Father of all men, to bless this institute and all who serve its purposes. May every student who comes within its gates find challenge to his mind, strength for his purposes and illumination for his soul. May America be strong in her faith, humble in her desire to serve the high purpose for which she became a Nation, wise in her progress and ever increasingly grateful for her privileges and her consequent responsibilities.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRED L. CRAWFORD

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my painful duty to inform the House of the passing of a former Member of Congress last Saturday, the Honorable Fred L. Crawford, who represented the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan here from 1935 through 1952. Mr. Crawford who resided at Allentown, Md., died Saturday night of a brain hemorrhage at Casualty Hospital.

Fred Crawford was born at Dublin, Tex., in 1888 and had a long and varied career in business activities prior to his first election to Congress. He could in many respects be described as a self-made man since his formal education terminated with the public schools. At various times he was an accountant, was active in manufacturing, ranching, and overland transportation. It was about 1929 when he settled in Saginaw, Mich., where he was associated in a prominent capacity with the Michigan Sugar Co. He was active in the financing and operation of various sugar beet mills and his experience in this connection stood him in good stead during his service in Congress.

Mr. Crawford was first elected to Congress in 1934 on the Republican ticket and served until his primary defeat in 1952. He was originally a member of the Committees on Territories, Public Lands, and Insular Affairs. He later served with distinction on the Banking and Currency Committee until the Legislative Reorganization Act and then chose to serve on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs where he advanced to the position of ranking minority member. He was particularly interested in our various Territories and possessions and was always endeavoring to emphasize their importance to this country. Among his many notable achievements was his labor in drafting legislation during the 82d Congress for the approval of the Puerto Rican Constitution. He was likewise active on behalf of farmers and was considered an expert in banking and financial matters.

Until his death, Mr. Crawford retained his directorship on the Michigan National Bank and also the Refiners Transport & Petroleum Corp. of Detroit. Both his ability and his interest in Michigan affairs is perhaps most clearly shown by the fact that during the worst days of the depression he pawned his personal life insurance to permit the opening of a sugar plant at Alma, Mich. This fact not only took many people of that area off the relief rolls and gave them active employment but it likewise turned into a profitable business venture. As a matter of fact, the company paid the Michigan beet-sugar farmers more for their beets than any other company in that area.

Since 1952, Fred Crawford returned many times to Capitol Hill as an official representative of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and also because of his very real affection for the House of Representatives and his many close personal

friendships which he had formed during his 18 years' tenure of office. A few years ago he organized a bank at St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands with which he continued association until his death.

In spite of the fact that I was directly responsible for the termination of Mr. Crawford's service in Congress, we always greeted each other pleasantly when we met here on Capitol Hill and on many occasions had interesting and, coming from my standpoint, profitable conversations. I can also speak from my personal experience when I say that Fred Crawford was deeply respected and admired throughout the Eighth Congressional District and that his many friends of long-standing will join with me and with the membership of the House in extending sincere condolence and sympathy to his wife, his son, and other members of his immediate family.

Fred Crawford was in many respects a controversial and colorful figure. He had, however, a highly developed sense of public responsibility, a very strong characteristic of personal integrity and a courageous determination to pursue what he believed to be the right course of action, regardless of political consequences involved. As I have said earlier, he was a very friendly and sociable person and brought real distinction to the State of Michigan and the House of Representatives during the time which he devoted to the interest of the people of his district. I am sure that many of my colleagues today will feel a sense of personal loss as keenly as will a great many people in the Eighth Congressional District and throughout the State and indeed the country.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I gladly yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know Fred Crawford well and also favorably. He was a man of splendid ability and good, sound character. His family have my deepest sympathy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to learn of the death of our colleague, Fred Crawford, whom I admired very much. It was only recently when I saw him and had a pleasant chat with him while he was visiting the House.

Mr. Crawford served with distinction and courage during his period of service in this body from 1933 to 1951. He was one of the most active Members on the floor and in committee. Mr. Crawford was one of the best versed Members on pending legislation, constructively participating in the consideration and debate on legislation that came before the House and in committee. He contributed greatly in reporting out of committee well-considered legislation.

In particular the people of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands will always remember his deep interest in their welfare and in legislation for their best interests.

I extend to Mrs. Crawford and her son my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I always admired Fred Crawford. I am reminded of the fact that it was only about a week ago that we had a little chat together out in the Speaker's lobby. I was very saddened to learn of his sudden passing, and I wish to extend to his wife and son my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the first men with whom I became acquainted in this Congress was Fred Crawford. At that time we met because of a common interest, an interest in the sugar farmers of our respective districts in their very fight for life, and for the right to sell what they had raised. I think Fred Crawford was the best posted Member of this House on banking and currency, and perhaps in general commodities. He knew them all. But before he became interested in the economies of Cuba and Puerto Rico, he likewise was well posted on the Philippines. Many times he has told me of the almost fabulous wealth of the island of Mindanao. I think it is remarkable that this district in Michigan had two such able Congressmen in a row. I transferred my affection to Mr. BENTLEY almost immediately when he came here, but it never affected the friendship I had for Mr. Crawford. We had numerous little visits that were always rare moments to me.

I wish to express my condolence to his wife and son, and I hope the son may follow in his father's remarkable footsteps.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am sorry, indeed, to learn of the death of my friend, Fred Crawford, a former distinguished Member of the House.

He was one of the first Members with whom I became acquainted when I came to Congress in 1949. His wide knowledge of public affairs; his courage and independence of thought and action, and his ready willingness to share of his knowledge and experience was of no small assistance to me in those early days of my service in Congress. Thus it is not easy to reconcile myself to the fact of his sudden and untimely death.

It was my pleasure to have had the opportunity to visit my former colleague on his farm near Washington and to meet Mrs. Crawford and their son. To them I extend the heartfelt sympathy of Mrs. Gross and myself in this hour of sorrow.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I was grieved indeed to hear of the death of Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Crawford belonged to that rapidly vanishing band who came here in the 74th Congress. He made friends. He gained respect. His kindness to me personally when I came here as a new Member is something I shall never forget.

I would like to extend my most understanding sympathy to his family.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the Record on the late Fred L. Crawford.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, Fred Crawford was a warm friend of mine for whom I had great respect and affection. He was a man without fear and always had the courage to stand by his convictions—and he had strong convictions. Such an attitude sometimes made people think of him as stubborn, and in some respects he was, but he was justified in his position because he was right more often than he was wrong. He studied problems thoroughly, analyzing them with care, and when he reached a decision he was always fortified with the facts and good reasoning. He was a fair and honest man, a tireless worker, and he enjoyed the company of purposeful people. He did not waste his time in fruitless conversation.

As an analyst of financial matters, he had few equals and his keen judgment in all matters was stimulating. After he left Congress it has been my privilege to see him at frequent intervals and I had the greatest admiration for his ability to dig out the important facts of a problem and suggest the solution. I am greatly saddened by his passing.

To those who knew him his loss is great and the memory of his friendly character, his honest thinking, and his loyalty will always be cherished by his friends. My warmest sympathy goes out to his wife and family and may their sorrow be made easier by the knowledge that his was a useful life blessed by many friends who respected him with real affection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my good friend Congressman BENTLEY in expressing deep regret at the death of former Congressman Fred Crawford. It was my privilege to know him intimately for many years, and I know the great American he was. His service in the House was a great contribution to the national welfare. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee he was an authority on financial and housing problems. His long service for agriculture made his views on agricultural problems extremely valuable. He was an authority on Puerto Rico, and above all he was an ardent American. He always put first the welfare of his country. A fine citizen and a conscientious legislator passed away when Fred Crawford died. To his wife and family I extend my deepest sympathy in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve with our late distin-

guished colleague, Fred Crawford, when I first came to this House at the beginning of the 78th Congress.

As a new Member at that time, Fred was very helpful to me and his constructive and kindly advice was very welcome. Fred Crawford was a hard worker and an able legislator. He worked diligently for the people of his district in Michigan during his many years of service in this House. He had deep convictions on most legislative issues and always had the courage to vote as he believed, regardless of his own political welfare. Those of us who were privileged to serve with him know of the many valuable contributions he made as a Member of Congress. I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Crawford and the other members of his family.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, like all of his host of friends, it was a great shock to me to read in the paper yesterday of the sudden death of our former colleague and my personal friend, Fred Crawford of the State of Michigan. Fred and I entered Congress at the same time in 1935 and because of our membership on the Committee on Insular Affairs, which involved a number of official visits to the Philippine Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, I came to admire his tireless energy, his keen mind, his complete devotion to public service, and considered him as one of my good personal friends.

During his period in the House, he was recognized as an authority on legislation pertaining to the Territories and insular possessions, as well as in matters related to banking and currency.

It was only a very few days prior to his death that I visited with him in the Chamber of the House and at that time he told me of his excellent health, energy, and vigor. With these words spoken to me by his own voice still ringing in my ears, the shock of his sudden demise was all the more stunning and sudden to me.

I extend to his lovely wife and fine son expressions of my deep sympathy.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, one of my dearest friends passed away last Saturday. I know that many of my colleagues share the loss of Fred Crawford in equal measure, for he was that kind of a person that you had to like.

With his boundless energy and keen, alert mind, and tireless enthusiasm, Fred's presence was always an inspiration. His fund of knowledge never ceased to amaze me. It enabled him to participate in every discussion and to make him a sort of nucleus of any discussion group. His participation always had a positive optimistic note, and it was his general character and enthusiasm and optimism which made the room seem just a little brighter when Fred walked in. He was a devoted family man.

Fred Crawford was a generous man, and to me this trait was best illustrated by the sense of responsibility which he assumed as a Member of Congress over the dependent peoples under the United States flag. Many of these, from the offshore areas, had no representation in the Congress; that is to say, they formally had sent no representative here. But

they had Fred Crawford, who was very able and equal to the task of representing such peoples. Being of courageous heart and never backing away from a fight, Fred Crawford saw that these people's interests were considered at every turn. Puerto Rico owes Fred Crawford more, I think, than he ever realized, for the battles he fought in its behalf in the days before Puerto Rico became a Commonwealth and fully self-governing in local matters.

Fred Crawford was an honest man and a fair man. There was never any doubt as to where he stood. He was a sound and practical man, and was to be identified with success in his many endeavors.

He was a tireless worker who believed that a task well done was a task one performed himself, and, indeed, Fred was building a structure on his farm when he was stricken.

I believe that Fred Crawford might well serve as an example to the young people of this country who must one day take over the reins of government and business, and to serve as provider and protector for family. For his example in all of these matters is worth following.

To his family, I offer my deepest sympathy and I share their grief. To all the many here who were his friends, I join in paying homage to our dear, departed friend, Fred Crawford.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the sudden and unexpected death of our former colleague last Saturday evening we are again reminded that man's duration here on earth is beyond our control.

We again become aware that no matter how great our contribution to our friends and country others will take up, and as God wills, carry on.

Great men and nations, great and powerful are born, live and die but time continues. Each contributes something to the world's progress. Millions have lived and then vanished into the past. But each has, for better or worse, filled his allotted space in his generation and time.

Our colleague was an able and industrious legislator. He was an astute and successful businessman. He was a patriotic and conscientious citizen. He was a faithful and ever-helpful friend. He was a loving and kind father, ever mindful of the future of his idolized son. A considerate and solicitous husband.

Mrs. Hoffman and I extend to son and wife our sympathy and hope for a lessening of their grief and sorrow. May his soul rest in peace. God welcome him home.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of my esteemed friend and former colleague, the Honorable Fred Crawford, grieves me.

No Member of Congress was more devoted to duty nor took his responsibilities more seriously as a servant of the people.

From early youth, Fred Crawford studied the intricate workings and problems of national and international trade and finance, and being schooled in that art he became a most valuable member of the House Banking and Currency Committee. He served on that commit-

tee for many years with great distinction.

I dare say that Fred's good services both in and out of Congress have and will be a benefit to every American for generations to come. On many, many occasions while Fred was in Congress and since, yes, to the very last he took time to counsel and advise with me on our United States fiscal conditions which as time went on became a greater worry to him, and without a doubt that worry contributed to the untimely death of this good man.

If being a conservative with the people's money is a virtue, and I believe it is, I must give the late Honorable Fred Crawford much credit for my conservative record in Congress.

Goodby, Fred. God rest your soul.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his family and to his multitude of friends everywhere.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret on a personal basis that I learned of the unexpected death of Fred L. Crawford on April 13. He had been in my office on several occasions the very week of his death. Then he appeared to be in wonderful health, and was his usual cheerful and energetic self.

I had known Fred Crawford since I first came to Congress. He led the first Congressional committee to Alaska to hold hearings on statehood. Fred Crawford did a terrific job then. From that time on he was a leading advocate of statehood for Alaska. His help was given to us Alaskans in ever so many other ways. Of course, I am aware that the other Territories and possessions also benefited from his wise advice and counsel and leadership. It is interesting to note that this Member of Congress from Michigan was possessed of the vision which led to so many changed concepts in reference to American areas beyond the seas. During the years since he left Congress we Alaskans have missed Fred Crawford in his official capacity; but his enthusiasm was such that even since then he has guided us, counseled us, and helped us.

Hundreds of Alaskans knew Fred Crawford; some of us knew him well. We treasured his friendship. We grieve now because we have lost a friend. We grieve because the Nation has lost a man who served it well. We grieve most of all because Betty Crawford and their son have lost husband and father. To them I should like to extend deepest sympathy on behalf of the people of Alaska, and for Mrs. Bartlett and myself personally.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound regret that I learned of the unexpected passing of our former colleague and my personal friend, Fred L. Crawford, on April 13. I know many of our colleagues will miss the warm and friendly visits of Fred Crawford in their offices and on the floor of the House.

Fred Crawford was a kindly and generous man. He was known and respected for his painstaking work with the non-self-governing areas under the United States flag. As a Member of Congress from 1935 to 1952, Fred Crawford played a vital role in obtaining independence

for the Philippine Islands, commonwealth status for Puerto Rico, and organic legislation for Guam and the Virgin Islands. In addition, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories, he held hearings in American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and Guam. He had a personal knowledge of and interest in the welfare of thousands of our islanders in the Caribbean and the Pacific. For 20 years he was a strong advocate of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. After his retirement from Congress he maintained an active interest in the affairs of our offshore areas.

Besides being an excellent legislator, Fred Crawford was a keen and practical businessman and financier. He had widespread business and farming interests on the mainland and in the Virgin Islands. He was the organizer of the West Indies Bank & Trust Co. in the Virgin Islands, an outstanding financial institution in the Caribbean. To thousands of persons in the Virgin Islands, Fred Crawford brought the concept that banking was something for the little-business man and farmer as well as for those in the higher-income brackets. To them, Fred Crawford was a benefactor and a true friend.

In the years I served with Fred Crawford on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs my interest in our dependent areas waxed and bloomed. I learned much from him in the appreciation of islanders' appetite for self-government and in the need for creating an outlet for their dignity, sense of responsibility, and willingness to cooperate with the Federal Government. I have lost a personal friend whose judgment and advice I often sought.

The people of our offshore areas have lost a true friend. I share in their loss. To his wife and son I offer my sympathy and share their grief. To all of us who were his friends and colleagues—I join in paying homage to the late Fred Crawford.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I served with Fred Crawford for many years on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He was the second ranking Republican on that committee and at one time the chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories. He took an intense interest in all the matters under the jurisdiction of our committee, especially those matters relating to the offshore areas such as Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. After his retirement from Congress he actively devoted himself to business enterprises in the Virgin Islands.

Fred Crawford was one of the best legislators I have ever served with. He was intelligent, industrious, and forthright. His extensive business experience gave him a fine grasp of many of the problems which come before the Congress. Fred Crawford was an independent thinker. He would disagree occasionally with his own party just as vigorously as from time to time he disagreed with the Democrats. He was a man who stood up for what he thought was right. On one occasion he spent a short period in a Maryland jail rather than submit

to the extortionate bonding practices conducted in that State when he was accused of a minor offense. This exposed him to a good deal of publicity which some people would have avoided. But he preferred to face the publicity rather than be victimized by the bond racket. I felt that the incident distinguished Fred Crawford as a man of singular courage and independence of thought.

More important than all of this, he was a very close personal friend in whose opinions and conclusions I reposed great confidence. His passing is a deep personal loss and I extend my sympathy to members of his family.

MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF VETERANS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL AT MANILA, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks the bill which I introduced early today to provide for the more effective utilization of the Veterans Memorial Hospital at Manila and to strengthen the medical care and treatment of certain Philippine veterans who served in the Army of the United States during World War II, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the bill provides for the more effective utilization of the Veterans Memorial Hospital at Manila, as I have said.

In late 1955 a \$9 million veterans hospital was opened in the Philippines to care for sick and disabled Filipino veterans who fought with our forces in the dark days on Bataan and who continued the fight as guerrillas against the enemy until General MacArthur returned to the islands.

This hospital, built under a grant of United States funds, is owned and operated by the Philippine Government under a formal international agreement containing restrictions on the use of the facility based on provisions of the authorizing law.

The late Philippine President, Ramon Magsaysay, whose tragic passing was mourned by the free world only a few weeks ago, held close to his heart this program of care for Philippine veterans in which, as in many other fields, our respective Governments cooperated.

In 1948, while a Philippine Congressman, his fellow veterans selected him to come to Washington and bring to our attention the sad plight of the defenders of Bataan, whose service-connected disabilities were untreated. The Congress promptly corrected this through passage of a bill which I had the privilege of introducing.

Somewhat later, as Secretary of Defense, Mr. Magsaysay took the time from

his major task of breaking up the Communist movement in the Philippines, to personally direct the planning and construction of the great Philippine Veterans Memorial Hospital which as President he dedicated 18 months ago. Our own Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. Higley, participated in that ceremony.

Mr. Speaker, I have learned of certain problems involving this fine new hospital which were of serious concern to our great friend, President Magsaysay, a few short days before his untimely death. Since the bill I am introducing today is designed to alleviate these problems, I want to explain them briefly.

Both changes in the law I am proposing are designed for better utilization of the new Philippine hospital. One change would permit the Philippines complete freedom in using the remaining beds after the needs of service-connected cases are met. It is also proposed to provide outpatient treatment for those whose needs can be met in this manner, thereby releasing additional beds for Philippine Government use.

In 1948 it was thought that treatment of those with serious war disabilities would require more than the entire 722-bed capacity of the new hospital. However, I am told that now, largely because of a high death rate on Bataan and during the occupation, this is not the case. It is a sad fact that as a result of the lack of medicines and treatment in the Philippines in those dark days so many died that there remain fewer disabled to be cared for than we anticipated.

It is now understood that of about 630 patients in the 722-bed hospital the needs of approximately 200 could be met by outpatient treatment, which unfortunately our original law did not provide.

If outpatient treatment were provided, based on careful screening of patients, over 300 beds as well as much of the fine equipment and other facilities would be available beyond the needs of the veterans for whom we are responsible. The Philippine Government should not be restricted in their use of these facilities.

It was one of the last wishes of President Magsaysay that these facilities could be made available for Philippine veterans not presently eligible and to provide a great medical research and training center badly needed in the Philippines. Except for beds actually used for VA patients, no other expense would accrue to the United States. It is simply a matter of removing present restrictions to give the Philippine Government a free hand.

The original intent of our 1948 law would remain inviolate as those service-connected veterans for whom we have assumed responsibility would continue to have top priority in the new hospital.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this body will see fit to carry out the last wishes of our great friend in Asia whose passing, as was said of Abraham Lincoln, was—

As when a lordly cedar, green with boughs,
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky.

The bill is as follows:

A bill to provide for more effective utilization of the Veterans Memorial Hospital at Manila, to strengthen the program of medical care and treatment for certain Filipino veterans who served with the Army of the United States during World War II, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 1, 1948, as amended (50 App. U. S. C. 1991-1996), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"For the purposes of this act the term—

"(1) 'veterans' means persons who served in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the service of the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States, dated July 26, 1941, including among such military forces organized guerrilla forces under commanders appointed, designated, or subsequently recognized by the commander in chief, Southwest Pacific area, or other competent authority in the Army of the United States, and who were discharged or released from such services under conditions other than dishonorable;

"(2) 'service-connected disabilities' means disabilities determined by the Veterans' Administration under laws which it administers to be connected with the service described in (1) above.

"Sec. 2. The President may assist the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for veterans who are in need thereof for service-connected disabilities, through grants to reimburse the Republic of the Philippines for expenditures incident to such hospitalization, for a period not to exceed 10 consecutive years beginning with calendar year 1950. The total for such grants for any one calendar year shall not exceed the following amounts: for any year prior to 1955, \$3,285,000; for 1955, \$3,000,000; for 1956, \$2,500,000; for 1957, \$2,000,000; for 1958, \$1,500,000; and for 1959, \$1,000,000.

"Sec. 3. (a) The program of assistance provided by section 2 of this act may be modified by agreement between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines with respect to any period commencing on and after the date of enactment of this section as follows: In lieu of grants to reimburse the Republic of the Philippines for expenditures incident to hospitalization, the Veterans' Administration may afford hospital care in the Republic of the Philippines at any time to veterans determined by the Veterans' Administration to be in need thereof for service-connected disabilities. When such hospital care is afforded in the Veterans Memorial Hospital, the Veterans' Administration shall pay to the Republic of the Philippines a per diem rate jointly agreed by the two governments to be fair and reasonable for each day of hospital care afforded under this section. The Veterans' Administration also may contract with any other hospital in the Philippines to afford such hospital care if the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs determines that the use of such other hospital would be advantageous.

"(b) In addition to hospital care afforded pursuant to subsection (a) hereof, the Veterans' Administration may afford outpatient treatment for veterans determined by it to be in need thereof for service-connected disabilities under the conditions and subject to the limitations on outpatient treatment applicable generally to beneficiaries under Veterans' Administration Regulation No. 7 (a), as amended, through facilities maintained by the Veterans' Administration in the Philippines or by contracting for such treatment.

"(c) The existing agreement between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines respecting the use of the Veterans Memorial Hospital at Manila may be modified

by agreement between the two countries to provide for the use by the Republic of the Philippines of the beds and equipment in that hospital in excess of those required for the hospitalization of veterans for service-connected disabilities in such manner as the Republic of the Philippines determines would afford the best utilization of such facilities. Such modified executive agreement if entered into shall specify, however, that priority of admission and retention in such hospital shall be accorded veterans needing hospitalization for service-connected disabilities.

"Sec. 4. The President may from time to time prescribe such rules and regulations and impose such conditions on the receipt of benefits under this act as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act; and he may delegate in whole or in part the authority conferred upon him by this act to any officer or officers of the United States.

"Sec. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this act shall not affect the availability and use of appropriations heretofore made for the purposes of the act of July 1, 1948, as it existed prior to enactment of this amendatory act.

THE CITY OF CHICAGO

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of our beloved dean of the Illinois delegation, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, I am calling the attention of the House to another great honor that has come to the city of Chicago. The magazine *Look* has conducted a survey of the cities in the United States that during the last year have made the greatest advance in improvement of housing conditions and a distinguished jury selected by that publication has just named Chicago as among the nine cities of the Nation to receive its 1956 Community Home Achievement award.

The award winning cities are Baltimore, Chicago, Indianapolis, Little Rock, Memphis, Norfolk, Rochester, Seattle, and Shreveport. Honorable mention goes to Dayton, Dallas, Clarksville, Los Angeles, Perth Amboy, St. Louis, and Washington Terrace, Utah.

The award given to the city of Chicago reads:

Chicago: The metropolis kept changing—for the better. It created a new planning department, to implement its plan Atlas, a master plan for future growth. It launched six new slum-clearance projects. The law department put the heat on slum landlords. Result: A sixfold increase in convictions of housing-code violators. Mayor Richard Daley proclaimed 1956 as Home Improvement Year. Greater Lawndale alone spent \$1½ million on home betterment. The 35 community conservation groups continued their work.

Mr. Speaker, when I visited Los Angeles in December of 1955 with the Rains housing subcommittee the witnesses at our hearings stressed what Los Angeles was doing in the way of enforcement of its building ordinance. Los Angeles was doing a great job and our committee

properly was impressed with what was being done there in the administration of our former colleague, the Honorable Norris Poulson, now the mayor of Los Angeles.

But in the awards voted by the distinguished judges elected by *Look* magazine, Chicago is given a higher award than that voted to Los Angeles, which itself has done a terrifically good job and receives honorary mention. It will be noted that in the reasons for Chicago's selection among the top nine American cities is the heat that has been put on slum landlords by Mayor Daley and Corporation Counsel John C. Melaniphy and his able staff.

The Chicago delegation feels a great sense of pride in bringing to the attention of the House and to the people of the country this most recent evidence of the giant strides Chicago is making under the dynamic leadership of Mayor Richard D. Daley. I am especially proud because the Honorable John C. Melaniphy, the corporation counsel, whose office has so vigorously prosecuted violators of the housing code with an all-time record of sixfold increase in convictions, comes from the great Second District of Illinois.

HIGH COST OF THE EASTER EGG

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today, April 15, can be said to be Federal income-tax day throughout the United States. Midnight tonight is the last moment for the people of the United States to file their Federal income-tax returns without penalty. Sunday, April 21, is Easter Sunday. It is celebrated by Christians all over the Nation. In addition to its serious significance, Easter day is a happy time for children in every community in the United States, who have come to associate their fun and pleasure with the so-called "Easter Egg."

In view of these facts and the closeness of these two dates, it is of serious interest to have a close look at this so-called "Easter Egg." Aside from its many painted colors that make it attractive to children and its wonderful qualities as a food, the Easter egg is becoming a very expensive pleasure.

In addition to his income taxes, Mr. John Q. Taxpayer is burdened with taxes he is vaguely aware of, such as Federal excise taxes added to the price of many products he purchases. In fact, there are many tax levies regarding which he knows nothing. These are known as hidden taxes.

According to some statistics on these hidden taxes assembled by the Tax Foundation, a private nonprofit research organization, it is disclosed there are over 100 hidden taxes on 1 hen's egg. Little do the children know, as they search for their Easter eggs, that the egg they find is actually a little gold nugget. Little do they know the money this egg has cost their parents in the nature of taxes. Without a doubt, there

is even a tax on the colors used for coloring the eggs.

But the Easter egg is not alone. A man's Easter suit has over 116 hidden taxes and that Easter bonnet that means so much to every feminine, whether she be 10 or a hundred on Easter morning, has over 150 hidden taxes.

And so it is, Mr. Speaker. And Easter Sunday is becoming an expensive day along with all of the rest throughout the year. In fact, I have just learned a very enterprising study is being made on ways and means of placing a tax on the air which we breathe.

A SALUTE TO FRANKLIN, KY.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the Kentucky Chamber of Commerce on April 10 named Franklin, Ky., the outstanding community of the group II cities. Group II cities are those with a population of more than 3,500, and an award of \$1,000 donated by the Kentucky Utilities Co. was accepted by Mrs. Nell James, president of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Franklin.

The progressive small city of Franklin located in the heart of a fine agricultural section of south central Kentucky, served by the Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. and bisected by Highway United States 31W, has good schools, nice homes, many churches and wide tree-shaded streets, but the citizens decided that all of this was not enough. More would have to be done to make Franklin progressive enough to give the young people an interesting future at home. Franklin went to work.

An outstanding businessman, Paul Massey, was drafted for mayor. He was backed by a strong council, an excellent chamber of commerce, and the people of Franklin. The struggle was half won. Interest was maintained in large part and progress reported by the fine articles and editorials in the newspaper, the Franklin Favorite, edited and published by L. L. Valentine, and by radio station WFKN. The industrial development board of the Franklin Chamber of Commerce became quite active in planning and building for the future. On their advice, land well located was purchased and held for industrial development.

Today Franklin can boast of new school buildings, new street-lighting projects, good hospital, improvement and modernization of existing businesses and new industry and expanding business along many lines.

Franklin has found in preparing a place of interest for her children that it has also become interesting to people outside of Franklin.

May the Commonwealth of Kentucky develop more cities with the spirit shown by Franklin. Not only will those cities become stronger and more progressive but in turn they will strengthen their counties and our great State.

CREDIT UNIONS HELP SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday, April 11, I brought to the attention of the House the proposal made by Mr. Edward T. McCormick, president of the American Stock Exchange, to the bankers of Wall Street, that they, the bankers, should appoint a special committee to study the credit problems of small business. Mr. McCormick proposed that the bankers should be ready to advise the small-business men and should help in providing equity capital to them. I was happy to commend Mr. McCormick's proposal and to repeat that which we have said repeatedly, that the Select Committee on Small Business is anxious to have the cooperation of the banks, the insurance companies, Government agencies, and all others who are interested in this problem of credit for small business. Our committee is, and has been for some time, laboring with this problem. Difficult as it is, in every aspect, we are determined to make a real contribution to its solution.

I want to call your attention now to the contributions being made by credit unions to small-business men in need of credit.

I have always been grateful, and will always be grateful, for the opportunity which I was given to sponsor in the House the legislation which provided for the granting of charters to credit unions by the Federal Government. I have been grateful when the leaders of the credit-union movement in the United States turned to me to sponsor legislation, or to present their cause to this House.

A year or so ago we began to seek for facts about the credit facilities which were available to small business. In this work we were offered, now and then, suggestions by representatives of small business. And one of the suggestions which came to us was that credit unions might provide us with a pattern which could be used to develop a credit facility for small business. Some of the leaders of the credit unions then offered to assist us, to assist us without cost to us, and without any reward for themselves. Thus I was interested in the story of Sterling, Colo.

I wish that every Member of this House could get a copy of the credit union magazine, *The Bridge*, for April, and would then find the time to read the first article published in this issue, the article entitled "Setting Up Small Business." The story is the story of the assistance given by the community credit union in Sterling, Colo., to the small-business men of that city.

Up one street and down another in Sterling—

The writer reports—

you see small-business men who either got into business, or expanded their business, or

kept their business through bad times, thanks to the Sterling community credit union.

On another page of the magazine you will find a map of the city of Sterling. Circles are drawn along the streets on this map to present graphically the picture story of the businessmen and the businesses that have been helped by the credit union. It will not be possible to reproduce this map in the RECORD, but I am going to ask that the article be placed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks. And I hope that it will be read and discussed widely.

The story of Sterling is one of the most interesting stories of credit unions and their work. But we have learned, as we have sought for information, that many scores of credit unions throughout the country have been assisting some of their members who are small-business men. Perhaps we have begun to find one of several ways to do a big job.

Mr. Speaker, within a few weeks now there will be organized in four counties in Michigan a countywide credit union made up of the retail gasoline dealers in those four counties. The project has been developed and has been put on paper. The officials of the credit unions will meet in a week or so and will approve the final articles of incorporation and then will ask for a charter from the State of Michigan. The leaders of the Michigan Credit Union League have given of their time and all of their facilities to aid these small-business men. The operation is a pilot-plant operation. Everyone interested is working together, contributing to each other from what they have. They want to know whether the credit-union road is one of the good credit roads for small-business men to take.

I want to refer to one fact as I present this information to the House. The accomplishment of the community credit union in Sterling, Colo., is due, in some part, at least, to the work of H. Vance Austin. I assume that some of you will know Mr. Austin. You will be glad to know that he is now the managing director of the Credit Union National Association at Madison, Wis. When my good friend, Prof. H. B. Yates, a good man and a great man from Texas, resigned as managing director of CUNA a few months ago, Mr. Austin was elected to succeed him. I know that Professor Yates was happy to turn the responsibilities of that office over to his friend, Mr. Austin.

I have wanted to pay tribute to Mr. Yates, and this is an opportunity to do so. He retired from the most important position in CUNA because his health would not permit him to continue in the job. He retired from the teaching profession some years ago, and as he retired he carried with him a tremendous asset of thousands of friends. He did most of the labor in building one of the finest credit unions in Texas, a credit union of teachers. He contributed much to the development of the national organization of credit unions. I am confident he established a record in CUNA which will become an example for his successors. And I know that he had

complete confidence that Mr. Austin would justify the confidence Professor Yates had in him.

SETTING UP SMALL BUSINESSES—THE COMMUNITY CREDIT UNION IN STERLING, COLO., HAS HELPED START A LOT OF MEMBERS IN BUSINESS FOR THEMSELVES, AND BACKED UP OTHERS WHO NEEDED MONEY FOR EXPANSION

Mr. Average Small-Business Man in Sterling, Colo., probably owes his business to the community credit union.

Wilfrid Foxhaven does; he runs a gas transport. Pete Hoppol does; he operates a service station. Wayne Rossen does; he runs an elevator. Elbert Coats does; he's an auto specialist.

Up one street and down another in Sterling you see small-business men who either got in business, or expanded their business, or kept their business through bad times, thanks to the Sterling Community Federal Credit Union.

Last year alone, with loan volume nearly \$1 million, the Sterling Credit Union made 87 loans for investments in business ventures. These business loans totaled \$210,821. In the past 10 years the credit union's business loans probably totaled more than \$1 million.

Some of these small-business men got their credit-union loans after being rejected by the banks. Others have always made a practice of going to the credit union first.

Most of the business loans run around \$2,000 to \$4,000. But they run as low as \$400 and as high as \$33,000. Only once has a cosigner had to pay off on a business loan made through the credit union.

This liberal mixture of small business loans helps make the Sterling Credit Union a thriving enterprise. For the past 5 years the directors have declared a 4 percent dividend on shares and for the past 2 years a 10 percent interest refund.

In Sterling's case the power that turns credit union capital into small business finance comes from an aggressive credit committee. It meets two, maybe three, times a week and is "on call" constantly.

A Bridge reporter interviewed some small-business men financed by the credit union. This is what they said:

SET UP FEED GRINDER

James K. (Jim) Lindsey has never borrowed a dollar from a bank, but he owes his business to credit union loans. He's a custom feed grinder, preparing cattle feed and mixing molasses with the native grains which provide Logan County a steady source of income.

In 1948 Lindsey moved into Sterling with a feed grinding gang from Kaw Dehydrating Co. in Topeka, Kans. That winter and the next he worked in Sterling, returning to Topeka in the summers. In the winter of 1950 he decided against moving any more. His son was nearing school age, and Lindsey didn't want to be shuttling the boy in and out of school.

He joined the credit union, his first membership in such an organization, and in the spring of 1950 got a \$4,400 loan to buy some used equipment. He started with a 24-inch grinder and little more save plenty of know-how. In the 7 years since he has borrowed another \$10,000 and now has a 36-inch grinder, a molasses truck and a fork truck.

Lindsey's work takes ironman endurance. The feedgrinding season is during the winter, when cattle must be fed prepared feeds because snow and ice cover the natural feed. Lindsey either heads a 3-man crew in the fields or works 3 men. This winter he had to take time out and give his health some overdue care, but his credit union-financed grinder has stayed busy.

HAMBURGERS AND MALTS

Mr. and Mrs. Charles Nelson don't have to take the abuse from weather that Jim Lind-

sey does, but they work long hours the year around in their malt shop. It's a clean, tidy hamburger and frozen-cream stand about a block from a public school and less than a half block from the credit union office.

Charlie Nelson's membership in the Sterling credit union goes back to 1938 when he was a school custodian. He never had done anything but odd jobs until a couple of years ago when he opened a cafe at Holyoke, a small town near Sterling. Then in July 1956 he had a chance to buy the complete stock in the malt shop for \$400. The credit union furnished the cash.

Each day at noon the Nelsons are snowed under. It takes the Nelsons and 3 or 4 high school girls to handle the rush of hamburger and malt orders. The hours are long and the work continuous, but Charles Nelson supports six people off the malt shop which the credit union helped him buy.

A WELDING BUSINESS

Rankin Thomas, 53, and his son, Lee Wood, 28, may be well on their way to dominating the important machine shop business in Sterling. Their Palco Welding Works caters to oil business. "We work the oil business pretty good," Lee Wood says, "and we treat the boys good. The steel strike in 1955 pretty near got us, but Mr. Poole carried us. We couldn't make our payments."

Lee Wood arrived in Sterling from Palco, Kans., March 21, 1954, and worked as a welder, a trade he had learned from his dad. Lee traded in his car for his first welding truck, and Palco Welding Works was formed soon after.

In December 1954, Lee got a \$300 credit union loan to make a downpayment on a house. Then he borrowed \$4,800 to buy another truck and complete welding rig.

Now Palco Welding Works has 4 trucks and 5 welders. The father-son team owns its building, has about \$35,000 invested in machinery and is looking for the long, steady haul which will help them pay back the credit union. Lee Wood puts it, "To me the credit union is run by a bunch of honest people. They care what happens to you."

Mrs. Ha Strunk's work tools are scissors and hair dryers instead of blow torches and wire pliers. She operates one of Sterling's largest beauty shops in the same location where she has been 21 years. When the Bridge reporter visited her she had just a week ago installed five new hair dryers. A \$1,200 credit union loan paid for them.

Mrs. Strunk and her husband joined the credit union in 1947. Since then she has borrowed a total of \$2,330 to keep her four-booth shop among the town's best. It gives Charlie Poole particular pleasure to okay Mrs. Strunk's loan applications because she graduated from Sterling High School under him when he was high school principal and before he entered credit union work.

EXPANDING A MOTOR COURT

William (Bill) Venohr runs the Plaza Motor Courts directly across the street from the credit union office. The Bridge reporter called on him in February, the slowest month of the year for Venohr's 24-unit court. He carried the smell of fresh paint from his workshop where he was tending to midwinter maintenance.

Bill Venohr was born and raised in Wattersdorf, Germany. His father was a member of the village Raiffeisen Verein (society), the forerunner of the credit union. Young Venohr came to this country and became a livestock buyer for Armour & Co. That work eventually settled him in Sterling, where in 1950 he entered the motel business.

"Sterling is a good resting place," Venohr explains. A credit union loan didn't put him in the motel business, but an \$18,000 loan from the credit union helped him consolidate some debts and begin a remodeling program which has made his motel one of the finest on United States Highway 138.

Those five striving businesses show why the Sterling Credit Union holds such prestige in its community. Small-business men have found it a source of dependable and convenient credit.

The Sterling Community Federal Credit Union was chartered July 21, 1938, with \$90 assets. Originally the credit union was suggested for the First Methodist Church, but the then pastor disliked the suggestion and blunted that effort. The credit union originated as a cooperative enterprise, but was soon changed to a community type. As such it serves virtually all of Logan County, where approximately 25,000 people live in an area just larger than the State of Delaware. Any Logan County citizen is eligible for membership.

The credit union's membership reached 2,431 on December 31, 1956. Members' savings stood at \$1,239,841.18 on the same date—another steadily climbing figure. Last year the average loan, including loans for all purposes, was \$842.45 and an average shareholding was \$510.

OIL ADDS TO GROWTH

In number of loans made and amounts loaned, however, the credit union has had a brief spurt and is now leveling off. Oil, with its multiple economic blessings and problems, hit Logan County in a commercial way in 1952. Oilworkers, eager for local credit, swarmed into town and the credit union started answering their needs.

One big loan item in the early 1950's was house trailers. Also, new houses for the newly prosperous, real estate money for investors and home improvements for the established. Credit union loan volume jumped from \$889,949.25 in 1952 to \$1,021,500.36 in 1953 and to an alltime high of \$1,022,885.81 in 1954. Total income, total expenses and net income kept pace with the growth.

TRAILERS WERE TROUBLE

Sterling's sudden spurt has slowed now, and the credit union has simmered down somewhat. Its loan volume last year, for instance, was \$994,937.30, or about \$25,000 below the record 1954. Of the money loaned last year \$680,075.91 was to members on 830 applications, \$219,500 was to other credit unions and \$375,000 was invested in savings and loan associations.

Several things caused the slackening-up in loan volume. Treasurer-Manager Poole says. "For one thing we began watching the loans a little closer. We got hurt on a few of those trailer house loans. We would lend a guy money on a trailer and he'd make one payment. The next month we would get a letter from him in Casper, Wyo., or somewhere else. For another thing the banks began liberalizing their loan policy. A new industrial bank was just starting, and they got some of our customers. Also the oil boom slowed down a bit, and crops didn't come in too well."

Despite the oil development, Logan County was and still is principally an agricultural area. Its big money crops in order of total value are wheat, sugar beets, barley, corn, alfalfa, field beans, oats, sorghums, millets, and wild hay.

Stock feeding pumps money steadily into the county and city economy. Cattle feeding is estimated to be a \$20 million annual enterprise, with some 80,000 head fattened annually in feed lots. With 623,761 acres of grazing land and 31,281 head of range cattle, Logan County is Colorado's second largest livestock producer.

By official count Sterling's 1950 population was 7,538. The 1952 city directory put the figure at 9,652, and a 1955 estimate was 12,500. Bank deposits, building permits, postal receipts and retail sales have shown similar gains.

The credit union not only kept pace with the county's growth, but actually anticipated and preceded it. From 1938 to 1948 the

credit union did business from a small downtown location. After the building owner gave notice that she intended to remodel the building and raise the rent considerably, the credit union sacrificed its downtown location for more room and a home of its own. Charlie Poole, Fidele Guenzi, and Louie Rieke, three longtime members, bought a plot of land about eight blocks from the business center and constructed a small masonry building for the credit union home. The credit union rents its space, a central office with handy counter and ample room for the desks of Poole, an assistant treasurer, and two secretaries, plus a directors' conference room.

IT'S CONVENIENT

As a convenient place to do business, the Sterling Community Federal Credit Union is a model. About 95 percent of its business is done across the counter, with the other 5 percent by mail. Office hours are 9 to 5:30 daily and 9 to noon Saturday. On the average day, between 60 and 75 persons will come in to make a share deposit, a loan payment, or both. In its 19-year history the credit union has made loans ranging from \$10 to \$33,000.

There's only one Negro family in Sterling, and they are longtime credit-union members. There are a number of Spanish-American families, and many of them have credit union-financed homes or cars.

TWO CREDIT COMMITTEES

The board of directors has made some by-law changes to keep pace with the credit-union's growth. For one, they rescinded a former rule which limited a man to serving two 2-year terms in succession in any one office. Too much talent and enthusiasm and willing work potential was lost as a result of that rule, they felt. Now Rieke, the credit committee chairman, is serving his third term. Interestingly, every member of the credit committee is a former chairman of that group, and the credit committee has alternate members who meet with the regular committee on call.

Whether it's a farmer wanting to buy feed for his hogs or a businessman wanting to expand his firm, each loan applicant gets personal and confidential consideration. Either Treasurer-Manager Poole or his assistant, Carl Waltz, meets with the applicant in the separate conference room. Either Treasurer-Manager Poole or his assistant "we try to dispel the idea that a credit union is just another lending agency. We point out the democratic fact that the credit union is owned by the members and that no man has more than one vote in its control. We don't find the 1 percent per month interest rate hard to explain, because we talk in terms of how much is the money going to cost the borrower. We will show him that we can lend him money cheaper than somebody else, or we'll show the borrower that he can get his money cheaper somewhere else if that is true."

WANTS HIGHER LIMIT

Poole believes that the \$400 Federal limit on signature loans is outdated. He would have the limit raised to \$1,000. "After all," he argues, "when you lend more, you're depending on the cosigner. If you can depend on him, you ought to be able to depend on the borrower." Also, Poole believes that his credit union has lost some loans because of the 3-year repayment limit, and he would raise that limit to 5 years.

Not only does the credit committee meet as often as necessary, with either Poole or Waltz meeting with them, but board of directors meetings are held subject to call. The Sterling Credit Union has no educational committee as such, but the board of directors takes that as part of its job.

THE AUDITING PROBLEM

"The weak link in our chain, and I don't think we're unusual," Poole says, "is our

supervisory committee. Not that we don't have good members, but it is just impossible to get them to make an audit more often than quarterly. Oh, it might do some good to have one of the credit committee members move over to the supervisory committee, but we feel that our first job is to get the money back to the members, and that certainly is what our credit committee does."

No small part of the Sterling Credit Union's success is attributed to its advertising and educational program. Last year that took a \$1,645.58 bite out of the total expenses of \$29,749.73. Much of the advertising money went to local newspapers and radio, about \$50 per month to newspaper and \$300 per year on radio.

The Sterling Credit Union feels strongly about benefits gained from league and national association membership. They spent more than \$300 last year on material from CUNA Supply Cooperative, including copies of every release which applied to their problems.

Last year the Sterling Credit Union had \$82,804.65 income, including \$63,288.14 interest on loans to members, \$11,904.17 on investments in savings and loan associations, \$5,783.38 on loans to other credit unions and \$1,828.96 on other income.

One feature of the credit union which Poole likes to mention is its family membership. Some families run as high as 15 or 20 members, each with a savings account. And there are a couple of proud grandfathers who see that each grandchild gets a \$5 account the day he is born. "You can't beat membership like that," Poole boasts.

The Sterling Community Federal Credit Union is a model of how well a credit union can serve a community's needs. In the process it has hung at least one record: It was the first Federal community type credit union in the United States to reach the \$1 million mark in assets.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. ARENDT) for the week on account of official business.

To Mr. SADLAK (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) to May 6 on account of official business attending council meeting, Interparliamentary Union, Nice, France.

To Mr. MULDER (at the request of Mr. SISK) for the balance of the week on account of official business.

To Mr. KEATING from April 8 to April 19, inclusive, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY, for 20 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, today, on a bill she introduced today, and for 5 minutes today on another subject, and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter; also for 5 minutes on tomorrow.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 10 minutes today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. GATHINGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McGOVERN (at the request of Mr. NATCHER) and to include a speech by Senator HUMPHREY.

Mr. McGRIGOR and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NEAL.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana.

Mr. PORTER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER to include two editorials in his remarks on Pan American Day.

Mr. MAHON to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULDER (at the request of Mr. BOLAND) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GARMATZ (at the request of Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. ZELENSKO (at the request of Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 126. An act for the relief of Ljubischa Nikolich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 130. An act for the relief of Frosso Spiliotou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 161. An act for the relief of Elias Youssef Mikhael (Ellis Joseph Michael); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 248. An act for the relief of Herta Kubelle Shields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 249. An act for the relief of Theodora Hegeman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 251. An act for the relief of Edith Elisabeth Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 253. An act for the relief of Josef Michael Adolff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 257. An act for the relief of Petronella Elisabeth Delmebeck Major; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 268. An act to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall return certain mineral interests in land acquired by him for flood-control purposes to the former owners of such land; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 368. An act for the relief of Jose Medina-Chavez (Joe Medina); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 385. An act to authorize the training of Federal employees at public or private facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 438. An act for the relief of Paul Er (Ear) Chen and Lydia Chen, nee Shih Ming Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 528. An act for the relief of Nicolaos Papathanasiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 560. An act for the relief of Alec Ernest Sales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 570. An act for the relief of Jeannine Theriaud Grantham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 771. An act for the relief of Rebecca Erriete Mustacchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 973. An act for the relief of Yun Wha Yoon Holsman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 987. An act for the relief of Leonardo Finelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 998. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1953 (67 Stat. 41), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1171. An act for the relief of Harry Siegbert Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1192. An act for the relief of Irma B. Poellmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1202. An act for the relief of Arsene Kavoukdjian (Arsene Kavookjian); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1203. An act for the relief of Lydia Anne Foote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1212. An act for the relief of Evangelos Demetre Kargiotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1346. An act for the relief of Jane Bailey (nee Jane Dzun Ma); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1360. An act for the relief of Mrs. Geraldine Elaine Sim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1412. An act to amend section 2 (b) of the Performance Rating Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1521. An act to exempt persons appointed to student trainee positions from the provisions of section 9 of the Civil Service Act prohibiting the employment in the classified service of more than two members of the same family; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1832. An act to authorize the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of S. R. 139, entitled "Technical Assistance"; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2367. An act to establish a deferred grazing program as part of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4271. An act to provide that the Delegate from Alaska in the House of Representatives of the United States may be a member of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission;

H. R. 6092. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Merrimack River Flood Control Compact; and

H. J. Res. 279. Joint resolution authorizing the procurement of an oil portrait and marble bust of the late Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to implement further the act of July 15, 1946, by

approving the signature by the Secretary of the Treasury of an agreement amending the Anglo-American Financial Agreement of December 6, 1945.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2367. A bill to establish a deferred grazing program as part of the relief available to drought stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4271. A bill to provide that the Delegate from Alaska in the House of Representatives of the United States may be a member of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission;

H. R. 6092. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Merrimack River Flood Control Compact; and

H. J. Res. 279. Joint resolution authorizing the procurement of an oil portrait and marble bust of the late Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, April 16, 1957, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

735. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report and findings on the San Angelo project, Texas, pursuant to section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 151); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

736. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for the month of March relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

737. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a notice of the intention of the Department of the Army and the Department of Agriculture to interchange jurisdiction of military and national forest lands, pursuant to Public Law 804, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

738. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

739. A letter from the Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, transmitting a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts for \$50,000 or more which were awarded during the period July 1 to December 31, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

740. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the annual report of operations for the calendar year 1956, pursuant to section 17 (a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

741. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on a contract between the United States of America and the Board of County Commissioners of Bernalillo County, State of New Mexico, and the board of trustees of the Bernalillo County Hospital, pursuant to Public Law 568, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

742. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to establish uniform procedures relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land for purposes of the national park system, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

743. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Madame Henriette Buallion and Stanley James Carpenter"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

744. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting additional material relative to the case of Shien Woo Kung, A-10087345, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and requesting that it be returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

745. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting part II of House Document No. 94 which was submitted on February 12, 1957, by the Secretary of the Interior, relating to a report with respect to the present status of negotiations with prospective purchasers of the falling water to be produced by the Trinity River division of the Central Valley project, pursuant to Public Law 386, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed as part II of House Document No. 94, 85th Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House April 11, 1957, the following bills were reported on April 12, 1957:

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6870. A bill making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROONEY: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6871. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 11, 1957, the following bills were introduced on April 12, 1957:

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 6870. A bill making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 6871. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

[Introduced and referred April 15, 1957]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 6872. A bill to provide for the development and modernization of the national system of navigation and traffic-control facilities to serve present and future needs of civil and military aviation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6873. A bill to provide for the development and modernization of the national system of navigation and traffic-control facilities to serve present and future needs of civil and military aviation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 6874. A bill to amend the provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to grants for construction of research facilities so as to increase their duration from 3 to 5 years and to authorize grants for medical and dental teaching facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6875. A bill to amend the provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to grants for construction of research facilities so as to increase their duration from 3 to 5 years and to authorize grants for medical and dental teaching facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 6876. A bill to exempt certain aspects of professional team sports from the anti-trust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6877. A bill to exempt certain aspects of professional team sports from the anti-trust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 6878. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to authorize Federal ship-mortgage insurance for fireboats; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 6879. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing quantitative restrictions on the importation of hardwood plywood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6880. A bill to provide that certain annuity payments, if waived, shall not be counted as income for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. R. 6881. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the "Gold Rush 'E'" Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H. R. 6882. A bill to further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 6883. A bill to adjust the tax rates on light sparkling wines in relation to those imposed on other wines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 6884. A bill for the establishment of a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study the outdoor recreation resources of the public lands and other land and water areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 6885. A bill to amend section 218 (d) (3) of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 6886. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize, in certain cases, the issuance of licenses to noncitizens for the operation of radio stations on aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 6887. A bill to permit one-half of the budget surplus for any fiscal year to be applied against the public debt and to provide that one-half of such surplus shall be applied as tax credits against individual income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 6888. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 6889. A bill to provide a minimum initial program of tax relief for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASKELL:

H. R. 6890. A bill to provide for the development and modernization of the national system of navigation and traffic control facilities to serve present and future needs of civil and military aviation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 6891. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 as amended so as to establish a National Development Priorities Council; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 6892. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, relating to assistance for the operation of schools in federally affected areas, to provide such assistance with respect to certain Federal activities at publicly owned airports; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 6893. A bill authorizing the restoration of Carter Lake, Iowa and Nebraska, in the interest of water conservation and recreation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 6894. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to unmanufactured mica and mica films and splittings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6895. A bill to discharge more effectively obligations of the United States under certain conventions and protocols relating to the institution of controls over the manufacture of narcotic drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 6896. A bill to ratify and confirm conveyances of allotted land on the White Earth Reservation in Minnesota by fullblood Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6897. A bill to provide that persons who have filed petitions for naturalization

may be employed as doctors in the Medical Service of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LENNON:

H. R. 6898. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain surplus property of the United States to Cumberland County, N. C.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 6899. A bill to provide that the compensation of star route, panel body, and mail messenger contractors shall be increased if their costs are increased because of a Federal or State statute, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. R. 6900. A bill to amend section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, so as to enable the Comptroller General more effectively to assist the Appropriations Committees in considering the budget; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 6901. A bill authorizing the participation by the Federal Government in the construction of a 4-lane high-level fixed bridge across the Intracoastal Waterway in the vicinity of Myrtle Beach, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 6902. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing quantitative restrictions on the importation of iron and steel wood screws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 6903. A bill to amend an act authorizing the disposition of lands no longer needed for naval purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H. R. 6904. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act with respect to measures for erosion control; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6905. A bill to provide for more effective utilization of the Veterans Memorial Hospital at Manila, to strengthen the program of medical care and treatment for certain Filipino veterans who served with the Army of the United States during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 6906. A bill to determine the need for a small boat channel from the port of Panacea, Fla., into Apalachee Bay; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 6907. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed governor and lieutenant governor, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 6908. A bill to authorize modification and extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans, to restore eligibility for hospital and medical care to certain veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States residing in the Philippines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 6909. A bill to establish a system for the classification and compensation of scientific and professional positions in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:
H. R. 6910. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, to include cranberries for canning or freezing; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 6911. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to eliminate certain inequities and restrictions and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZELENKO:
H. R. 6912. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an income tax deduction for depletion of human resources; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AVERY:
H. R. 6913. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make payment to owners and tenants of land acquired for Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, for certain business losses; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 6914. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to actions for infringements of copyrights by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:
H. R. 6915. A bill to adjust the tax rates on light sparkling wines in relation to those imposed on other wines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE:
H. J. Res. 309. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:
H. Con. Res. 163. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Atomic Energy Commission should establish an experimental nuclear reactor in the State of Washington; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. FLOOD:
H. Res. 233. Resolution directing the United States Tariff Commission to make certain investigations of imports of residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:
H. Res. 234. Resolution to request the President to request the resignation of Postmaster General and to designate an experienced official to temporarily discharge the duties of Postmaster General; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:
H. Res. 235. Resolution to provide that the Committee on Education and Labor shall conduct investigation and study of discrimination in employment against persons 40 or more years of age; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOSCH:
H. Res. 236. Resolution creating a committee to conduct an investigation and study the plight of the Transylvania Saxons; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: Memorial of the Senate of the State of South Dakota in the 35th legislative session, memorializing Congress to resist the efforts of proponents of centralization of Government to invade the field of education and usurp or encroach upon the right and duty of the people in the local communities to provide for and supervise the education of their children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

CIII—360

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to resist the efforts of proponents of centralization of Government to invade the field of education and usurp or encroach upon the right and duty of the people in the local communities to provide for and supervise the education of their children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the construction of a fish producing and rearing station in Sycamore Canyon, north of Cottonwood, Ariz., and in the area of Bullhead City, Ariz.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the purpose of increasing the span of the Fore River bridge in the city of Quincy; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize immediate modification of the navigation locks at Bonneville Dam, etc.; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide adequate safeguards in tariff and trade legislation, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the laws limiting the authority of such political subdivisions to issue general obligations bonds so that they may issue such bonds to a limit of 10 percent of the aggregate taxable value of the real and personal property within their corporate limits, etc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that Alaska be granted title to its shorelands, tide and submerged lands, and its inland waters; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend exemptions from Federal income taxation to those new industrial enterprises qualifying under the Alaska Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to extend the date of expiration for the making of loans thereunder from June 30, 1958, to June 30, 1960; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):
H. R. 6916. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Serrero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:
H. R. 6917. A bill for the relief of Marianna Giorgianni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:
H. R. 6918. A bill for the relief of Eugenio De Leo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 6919. A bill for the relief of Ezekiel A. Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:
H. R. 6920. A bill for the relief of Maria Natividad Ermanno Adolfo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6921. A bill for the relief of Irineo A. Salas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6922. A bill for the relief of Antonio Sencio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETTELLA:
H. R. 6923. A bill for the relief of Meriden Industries Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:
H. R. 6924. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to render findings of fact with respect to the claim of Carl E. Edwards against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON (by request):
H. R. 6925. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Antonina Borodina Buschman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:
H. R. 6926. A bill for the relief of Fortunato Castenada Herrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESS:
H. R. 6927. A bill for the relief of Paraskevi Chocheff Tarpoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:
H. R. 6928. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Fontanilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:
H. R. 6929. A bill for the relief of Randolph Stephan Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:
H. R. 6930. A bill for the relief of Chih Chou Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:
H. R. 6931. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Ablett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of North Carolina:
H. R. 6932. A bill for the relief of the estate of W. C. Yarbrough; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELDEN:
H. R. 6933. A bill for the relief of Myra Joyce Carroll and Shiela Jeanne Carroll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:
H. R. 6934. A bill for the relief of Fabcon, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:
H. R. 6935. A bill for the relief of Wang Fai (Freddie) Chun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

205. By Mr. PRICE: Petition of employees of the direct mail division of the Reuben H. Donnelly Corp. (Chicago office) for continuation of all types of mail service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

206. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, the Cuyahoga County Bar Association, Cleveland, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution relative to the conduct of Counsel Richard Arens, counsel for a subcommittee of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives, 84th Congress, during proceedings at Youngstown, Ohio, on November 26-27, 1956; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin,
Condemns Latest Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 15, 1957

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the most inflationary pieces of legislation of the 85th Congress has now been introduced.

I refer to the proposed legislation which would unfortunately make a hollow shell of Federal regulation of the prices of natural gas.

Specifically, I have reference to H. R. 6790 and H. R. 6791, introduced, respectively, by Representative OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, and Representative JOSEPH O'HARA, of Minnesota.

In my judgment, this proposed legislation poses a tremendous threat to the American economy in more ways than one.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on this subject be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for just a moment in connection with that he has just said with respect to the Harris bill?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I commend the Senator from Wisconsin for the action he is taking at the very start in opposition to the Harris bill, which has been introduced in the House.

When I was mayor of Philadelphia we had a mayors' committee which fought very vigorously against that bill. I know the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin was on that side, and did his very best to prevent its enactment. I assure the Senator from Wisconsin that he will have support in his efforts from at least one Senator on this side of the aisle.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Senator. My opening remarks contained a statement of my views. I shall continue to restate them in committee, and before the Senate, when the subject comes before us.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

For months, we have been reading disturbing newspaper accounts to the effect that a new version of the bill which President Eisenhower vetoed in the 84th Congress would soon be introduced.

Now this version has been offered.

This time, it attempts to accomplish its objective by permitting a so-called reasonable-market price to be charged.

But what is reasonable-market price?

It is the going price.

So, will this be regulation? Of course not; it is pretended regulation on the basis of an unregulated price.

So in its pretense at regulation, it is even worse than last year's more frank bill. In 24 pages of legal falderal, the bill deceptively

makes noises as if some regulation were really being attempted.

It sets up a standard for a regulatory agency which the Commission would find it impossible to follow. The criterion would be a quicksand of uncertainty into which every regulatory case would founder—if any attempt were made to actually enforce it.

The reasonable-market price would be changing constantly—upward.

The Commission investigators would have to scramble to keep up interminably with what the latest market price was.

Consequently, the Commission would be following the market price rather than leading, abjectly approving rather than independently establishing a fair regulated price, as all regulatory commissions are supposed to do.

The supporters of this legislation make no bones about what they really have in mind.

Their aim is the very same as it was in the 84th Congress, the 83d Congress, and in preceding Congresses—to deny the consumers of this Nation the reasonable protection which the consumers had a right to expect under the Natural Gas Act of 1938.

For months, we have been reading reports from natural-gas associations to the effect that if the administration really wants this legislation enacted, it—the administration—will have to work hard for it.

I hope that the administration will do no such thing.

I say very frankly, however and yes, sorrowfully, that I will not be surprised if the administration does come once again to the unwise decision of backing the purposes of this legislation.

Unfortunately, the administration has allowed itself to swallow the misrepresentations which have been spread by the natural-gas industry.

Unfortunately, the administration, which has been wisely pleading for a curb on inflation—which has been pleading for voluntary efforts to hold down wage and price pressures, this same administration now seems determined to do a rightabout-face. Thus, it probably backs a bill which will be one of the most inflationary measures in the 85th Congress.

Fuel is the key item in the cost of living and in the cost of production. When industry has to pay higher fuel costs, when 30 million homeowners have to pay higher residential gas costs, what is that but inflation?

We see in this legislation, too, one more unfortunate step down the road of ineffective regulation by a so-called regulatory agency. It is a road in which a Federal Commission does not seem to be actively interested in protecting the very public interest which it was set up to protect.

I say, frankly, but respectfully: The Federal Power Commission has repeatedly failed in its obligations vigorously to protect the public interest.

Instead, by backing the previous version of this legislation and by reportedly backing the present version of this legislation, the Federal Power Commission seems to say, in effect: "Gentlemen of the Congress, we will be glad to authorize whatever the 'traffic will bear,' if you will just permit us to do so."

I want to be fair to the Federal Power Commission—which, after all, faces enormous work burdens. I am not, of course, reflecting on the sincerity of any of its members. I respect their honest differences with me. I am simply stating that the Commission is not uniformly doing the job which the Congress originally intended for it.

Lastly, I want to reiterate a point which I have previously made. The oil and gas industry is definitely entitled to a reasonable return on their investment. The local gas

distributors are entitled to a reasonable return. The pipelines are entitled to a reasonable return on their investment.

But so, too, the public is entitled to reasonable protection.

There is no evidence whatsoever to indicate that the oil and gas industry has suffered under previous Federal regulation. There is every evidence to indicate that the industry has prospered, and that it will continue to prosper if reasonable regulation is carried on.

I hope, therefore, that this Harris-O'Hara legislation will be defeated.

I hope that it will be defeated on its lack of merit and not simply because of part of the oil industry's lobbying tactics, as carried on in the 84th Congress.

I hope the administration will reconsider its overall stand.

I support this administration generally. But I will not falter on my right to part company with the administration when my conscience tells me it is in the wrong.

Perhaps, there are some within the administration—within the Department of Justice or elsewhere—who support my stand and who disagree with the Harris-O'Hara bill. If so, I hope they will be in a position to come forth and openly say so.

Submarines Everlasting Honor and Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1957

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was Adm. Chester Nimitz who once said that the Japanese missed their golden opportunity at Pearl Harbor when they restricted their attack to capital ships. If they had knocked out our submarines, our task would have been infinitely greater. For as soon as the war started, our submarines began unsupported operations in Japanese waters and substantially damaged Japan's vitally important shipping.

"It was to the submarine force that I looked to carry the load until our great industrial activity could produce the weapons we so sorely needed to carry the war to the enemy," Admiral Nimitz has said. He added, "It is to the everlasting honor and glory of our submarine personnel that they never failed us in our days of peril."

Now this valiant—and relatively unpublicized—branch of our Armed Forces is getting the kind of recognition long due it. Throughout the Nation, a television program called the Silent Service is being shown to increasing millions of Americans. This series, based on authentic war reports, dramatically presenting the heroism and adventures of submarines at war, effectively delivers to the citizenry a weekly account of the vital role our submarine service performs in the Nation's defense.

The series was conceived in love and devotion by Adm. Thomas M. Dykers, United States Navy, retired, an old submariner himself who as commanding offi-

cer of the submarine *Jack* in World War II downed 4 Japanese tankers in 1 day—a feat unequalled by any other United States sub in the war.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to pay tribute to the glory of the men of the submarine service. I commend NBC Television Films for bringing this story to the American public and to WTOP-TV in Washington, D. C., where it begins on the air April 30, so that everyone, especially those in Government here, in the Nation's Capital, may know more about the Silent Service.

The Defense Department Has Not Yet Learned To Properly Utilize Its Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1957

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a great deal these days about the necessity of increasing the military pay of various branches of the Armed Forces in order to attract and to keep in the service of our country professional men and skilled technicians.

There is no doubt that such men, if worth their salt, will leave for private practice or private industry if the pay and working conditions are not sufficiently attractive to keep them in Government service. I favor paying these men fair compensation, the fairness thereof to be determined by the competitive demand for these men.

At the same time, it should be pointed out that the Defense Department traditionally has not utilized these men to the best advantage either of the Government or of the men.

We are constantly told that it costs as much as \$25,000 to train a recruit to deal with complicated matters requiring the attention of skilled men. The fact of the matter is that the complaints still pour in to Members of Congress from men who are called up to serve their country, as well as from men who have enlisted for that purpose. Thousands of these men have specialized college and university training. All too frequently such education and training is completely ignored and the men are assigned to training programs entirely foreign to what they have been equipped for. Thousands of dollars are spent by the Defense Department for such training, more properly called retraining. The training is hardly completed when the men leave the service.

Sergeants, good drillmasters despite their lack of formal education, still delight in assigning college-trained men to the garbage dump.

Thousands of dollars can be saved by the Defense Department by properly screening men and assigning them to work that they are already fitted to perform instead of trying to train them to do things in which they have no interest

and which will only drive them out of the service instead of keeping them in.

Our whole concept of military training still reflects the methods of the last century. It has not caught up with World War I, not to mention World War II, or the nuclear age.

Tribute to an Outstanding Citizen—Ian Ross MacFarlane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1957

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, with the closing of the Emergency Hungarian Refugee Operation, it seems a fitting time to review what has been done in resettling the thousands of gallant freedom fighters and their families in various American communities.

The contribution of the citizenry of Baltimore in this cause is one, Mr. Speaker, which I feel privileged to acknowledge with pardonable pride. Over 125 Hungarians have been brought or sent to Baltimore by various sponsors. This project has required the interest and patience of Baltimore industry in offering employment; the charity of religious organizations in donating clothing; the generosity and understanding of the Baltimore homeowner in making available living quarters where these Hungarian newcomers could live, not only in self-respect, but in an environment of genuine American family life. The YMCA, the Rotary Clubs, the Kiwanis, and other civic organizations, the police department, storekeepers, taxicab companies have all joined in a cooperative effort to assist these otherwise bewildered patriots from overseas.

However magnificent as has been the work, Mr. Speaker, of those already mentioned and the scores of others who have toiled so generously but without recognition, there stands out one Marylander who has been the originator, the spark, the driving force, the coordinator of all this tremendous achievement. He is Ian Ross MacFarlane, who this year marks his 20th anniversary as a radio commentator.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time Mr. MacFarlane has figuratively left his job as one of our State's most respected political reporters and news commentators to assist those who needed aid. During World War II and following his return from an overseas tour of duty that took him to the frontlines, Citizen MacFarlane sponsored the idea over his radio hookup that eventually resulted in the Congress enacting into law a measure that provided for increased allowances and allotments for the dependents of servicemen. Immediately after the cessation of hostilities, he led the fight that secured for 158 honorably discharged veterans the right to own and operate taxicabs in Baltimore. This group is still functioning and doing a standout job under the name of the G. I. Veterans

Taxicab Association of Baltimore. In organizing this company, Mr. MacFarlane insisted that it be based on equality for all. In other words, Mr. Speaker, integration of its membership from its very inception. In between gathering and editing news, Mr. MacFarlane served as president of this group for 5 years, leaving them with earned assets of over \$100,000.

Every veterans' organization in Maryland has honored Mr. MacFarlane by citations, medals, and plaques for his work in behalf of all veterans. In 1947, he was named the Baltimorean who has done most for the Negro people.

Being a humanitarian and a champion of the rights of all has been the keystone of Ian Ross MacFarlane's life. He is the first non-Jew ever to have lived and worked as a member of the Jewish agricultural colonies in Palestine. Since this period in 1933, he has constantly worked voluntarily for the cause of autonomy for Palestine, which he has seen come to pass with the establishment of the Republic of Israel. Today he is one of the outstanding champions for justice and understanding of this tiny outpost of democracy in the Middle East.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that when another voice of an underprivileged or persecuted person calls, Ian Ross MacFarlane is among the first to respond.

Therefore, it is a privilege and real pleasure to be able to pay tribute to Ian Ross MacFarlane in connection with his outstanding and untiring efforts in connection with the Hungarian relief program, and his many other civic activities.

Arrogance of the Postmaster General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1957

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, a senior member on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Mr. LESINSKI, commented on an editorial of the Detroit Times of April 15, as follows:

Under law the Federal employees do not have the right to strike against the Government. However, the Postmaster General has achieved the same effect as a strike and some action against him should be taken. As per my previous statement and the following editorial from the Detroit Times of April 15, 1957, he should resign.

The editorial, which I endorse wholeheartedly, is as follows:

The arrogance of Postmaster General Summerfield has brought about a bureaucratic shakedown of Congress and American taxpayers.

His arrogance succeeded last Saturday in canceling all regular mail deliveries in the United States on a business day for the first time in history.

It has succeeded beginning today in curtailing deliveries and hours when post offices are open to the public.

Mr. Summerfield high-pressured a congressional committee into voting him \$41 million extra to run his Department through the remainder of the fiscal year ending June

30. But even this did not move him to call off his cackback of service. He demands the money in hand.

His arrogance has hampered the operation of business and gravely inconvenienced the American people.

The "crack of doom" method he has used raises questions of his efficiency and competence.

Whatever bureaucratic victory he has gained, the Postmaster General has lost the confidence of the public.

He should resign.

The Washington Pilgrimage—A Symbol of the Religious Heritage of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1957

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, 27, and 28 the Washington Pilgrimage, under its 7th annual program, will visit our Nation's Capital to pay tribute to our great American religious heritage.

During the weekend hundreds of men and women of all faiths, from all parts of America, will visit patriotic and historical shrines, religious centers, memorials, and various institutions of Government. In the course of their program they will meet and hear personal messages from America's spiritual, cultural, and Government leaders. One of the outstanding events of their program is an awards dinner on Saturday evening, April 27th. At that time, Dr. Louis H. Evans, former pastor of the Hollywood, Calif., Presbyterian Church, and who presently represents the Presbyterian Church on a nationwide basis, will be named Clergy-Churchman of 1957. The award will be made by Mr. Cecil B. DeMille of Paramount Pictures, Hollywood, Calif.

The Washington Pilgrimage is an organized movement in America whose basic theme is "This Nation Under God," and whose purposes are:

To emphasize our national religious heritage.

To create a greater awareness of the spiritual vision and understanding of America's founders.

To rededicate ourselves to the spiritual origins of our country.

To strengthen our spirit of liberty under which Americans of all religious beliefs may prosper in unity.

To encourage vision, faith, and courage in order to revitalize our American faith in democracy and morality.

To recognize religious leadership by the only national awards in this field to the Clergy-Churchman, Lay-Churchman, Churchwoman of the Year, together with the Faith and Freedom Award in religious journalism.

Because of the importance of this occasion, and for the reason, in all probability, you will be visited by some of those participating in this important

event, I take this opportunity to acquaint you with the purposes and activities of the Washington Pilgrimage.

Proposed Tax Reduction for the Depletion of Human Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1957

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a new measure which would cut taxes for older workers by providing a tax deduction for the depletion of human resources.

This bill is aimed at encouraging older people to continue productive activity in business and industry. It would allow taxpayers 45 years of age and older to claim a special deduction for the depletion of human resources on their Federal income tax. There is no reason why there should be a distinction between the present deductions for the depletion of natural resources, machinery and property, and that of the depletion of the most important resource of all—the human one.

The proposed deduction would be computed strictly on the basis of the taxpayer's age and would apply only to salaries, wages, and earned income and would offer an added economic incentive for the older workers to realize their full potential as useful and productive members of the Nation's business and industrial population. At present, from a monetary standpoint, retirement benefits in many cases far outbalance earning inducements for people of 45 and over to remain actively employed.

These conditions have produced a steady and detrimental effect upon the size of our country's senior working forces. Unless Congress takes constructive measures to combat the problem, we will ultimately find ourselves faced with a nationwide shortage of skilled and experienced older workers who form the strength and backbone of so many of our leading industries.

The reduction in income-tax revenue would be balanced with a decrease in social security to older workers who, with the inducement of tax deductions, would choose to remain actively engaged in business and industry. The deduction for the depletion of human resources would be computed by subtracting 44 from the age of the taxpayer and multiplying the resulting figure by 1 percent of his earned income. In other words, as the taxpayer grows older he would be allowed to deduct 1 additional percent each year. Thus, a 66-year-old working taxpayer would be entitled to a deduction of 22 percent from his earned income.

I hope this measure will act to ease the problems of our older people in industry, to the mutual benefit of our senior citizens and our national economic structure.

Bridge Across the Ohio River Near Lawrenceburg, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1957

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a week or so ago I introduced a measure which would give Government approval to the creation of an Indiana-Kentucky bridge commission for the purpose of constructing a toll bridge across the Ohio River near Lawrenceburg, Ind. Since this is in the congested Cincinnati area, a bridge at this point would be very helpful.

A few days after introduction of my bill—on Monday, April 8, to be exact—this Chamber passed a measure calling for an appropriation of some \$10,500,000 for the construction of another bridge across the Potomac River between Virginia and Washington. There are already five Potomac bridges in this area.

It seems grossly unfair to me, Mr. Speaker, for the general American public to be asked to foot the cost of this project, with the State of Virginia paying no more, proportionately, than will Nevada, for example.

Also, the people in Indiana and Kentucky—and elsewhere, I am sure—are going to wonder why they have to finance all their bridges across the Ohio, while the entire Nation pays for bridges connecting the District of Columbia with Virginia and Maryland.

There are now four bridges spanning the Ohio River between Evansville and Cincinnati, a distance of some 350-river miles. Not a one of these was financed by public moneys. All were constructed as toll bridges, paid for by the people who use them. The people out there have not complained about it, either. They were glad to get the bridges, glad to pay for them. I am certain they will be equally as glad for the opportunity to pay, by the toll arrangement, for the proposed new bridge at Lawrenceburg.

I am familiar with all the arguments in favor of another Potomac bridge—the congestion, the fact that Washington is the Nation's Capital, and so forth—but I still cannot see the fairness of calling upon all American taxpayers to meet the cost.

I might point out that there is very much heavy traffic in the region of the Ohio. People now drive 30 or 40 miles to get to a bridge to cross that river. There are many important industrial centers, and there is much defense work going on. In event of armed attack against our country, the north-south traffic arteries and bridges would be of immense importance.

In seeking passage of my own Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission bill, I am not suggesting that one red cent come from Federal funds. All that my people want is the approval of the Government so that they can proceed, in an orderly manner, to set up a commission which

will plan all the details incident to financing and constructing of the bridge.

I wonder why other bridges, such as the Potomac projects, cannot be financed in a similar manner?

Plans Completed for 1957 Congressional Tour of New York City, May 10, 11, and 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1957

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, plans have been completed for the annual congressional tour of New York City and Kings Point Maritime Academy, May 10, 11, and 12.

This annual congressional tour for Members of both Houses of Congress and their families provides for 3 glorious days in New York at a cost of \$37.50 for adults and \$32.50 each for children between the ages of 5 and 12 years.

As in previous years, Members of the Senate and House of Representatives have received a most cordial invitation from Mayor Robert F. Wagner of the city of New York, who has instructed his city department of commerce and public events to make every effort to assure an interesting and well-balanced program for the reception and entertainment of the group making the 3-day tour of New York.

For the information of those who intend to make the tour, the following itinerary will be of interest.

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

Friday, May 10: 9:45 a. m. daylight time, we leave Washington via Pennsylvania Railroad. Luncheon will be served in dining car. We arrive New York Penn Station at 1:45 p. m. daylight time, and immediately board motor coach for tour of lower New York, including a stop at City Hall for reception by the Mayor, Hon. Robert F. Wagner. We also stop at the United Nations for a 2-hour tour. We arrive at the Paramount Hotel about 6 p. m. daylight time. The evening will be open to attend the theater or enjoy the bright lights of Broadway.

Saturday, May 11: 9 a. m. motor coaches will leave for Pier 83, Hudson River, to board excursion steamer for luncheon and harbor inspection until 2 p. m. From 4 to 6 p. m. the party will go aboard the Italian Line steamship *Cristoforo Colombo* at pier 84, Hudson River, for a reception and inspection of the ship. The party will then proceed to the Hotel Savoy-Plaza for a reception and buffet dinner after which the evening is open for theaters and other forms of entertainment.

Sunday, May 12: 8:30 a. m. motor coaches will transport the party to the foot of the Battery for a 9 a. m. departure via steamer up the East River through Hell Gate Rapids and out to Long Island Sound for a noon arrival

at the United States Maritime Academy pier at Kings Point, Long Island. After lunch and a review of the cadets, the party will return by bus to the Pennsylvania Station, New York City, and depart for Washington at 5:30 p. m. daylight time.

I should like to emphasize that this tour is for Members of the Senate and House of Representatives and their families, and reservations should be made immediately by calling Miss Patricia Bryan, extension 366 or 1830.

The Postmaster General Should Resign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1957

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the \$41 million deficiency appropriation should be approved quickly by Congress so that full postal service can be restored throughout the Nation. We cannot abide ill-considered "meat-ax" cuts vitally affecting thousands of families whose breadwinners are postal employees, as well as the millions of postal patrons who are entitled to rely on the mail service which has been established.

However, the Postmaster General should resign. I said so at the outset of this hassle; I say so again now, as do the *Detroit Times* and other leading newspapers, along with a number of Congressmen, including my friend and distinguished colleague, JOHN LESINSKI, Democrat, Michigan, who is a senior member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which committee I am also a member.

Now, did the Postmaster General violate the antideficiency law? Yes, says the Comptroller General in an opinion written April 12, 1957. He violated subparagraph (c) (1) which requires him to make the money appropriated to his Department last for the full year without the necessity of a deficiency appropriation.

The law provides no penalty for the violation of this section. I intend to introduce an amendment to provide for the same penalty applicable for violations of paragraphs (a), (b), and (h) of the Anti-Deficiency Act.

My considered opinion, as a lawyer, is that Mr. Summerfield violated paragraph (h), for which paragraph the penalty is, upon conviction, a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both. His guilt, of course, must be determined by a court. Therefore, I am turning over a copy of this statement to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia with the request that he take appropriate action and in due course advise me. I personally do not believe Mr. Summerfield should be fined or imprisoned, in view of the fact that there have been previous unprosecuted violations of the Antideficiency Act al-

though it appears that none was so gross, so flagrant, and so arrogantly carried out as the instance before us. In any event, if he were convicted, the matter of punishment would be for the court to decide.

All that I am saying as a lawyer is that there is a basis for prosecution for the following reasons:

Paragraph (h) of section 3679, Revised Statutes as amended—title 31, United States Code, section 665—commonly known as the Antideficiency Act, provides:

(h) Expenditures in excess of apportionment prohibited: penalties.

No officer or employee of the United States shall authorize or create any obligation or make any expenditure (A) in excess of an apportionment or reapportionment, or (B) in excess of the amount permitted by regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (g) of this section.

It is plain that Mr. Summerfield did authorize and create obligations in excess of the amount permitted under subsection (g), which subsection, so far as important, reads as follows:

The head of each agency, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall prescribe, by regulation, a system of administrative control . . . designed to (A) restrict obligations or expenditures against each appropriation to the amount of apportionments or reapportionments made for each such appropriation.

A study of the reapportionments made by the Bureau of the Budget at the recommendation of the Postmaster General shows that the fourth quarter apportionments beginning with December 14, 1956, were \$11 million below the "apportionment" made on July 13, 1956, and were \$31 million below the July 13 "apportionment" by reason of a "reapportionment" accomplished on February 4, 1957. A study of the eight adjustments of the "apportionments" will show that the Postmaster General decreased the fourth quarter "apportionment" by three different "reapportionments," which resulted in the fourth quarter "apportionment" being \$40,727,100 less than the third quarter "apportionment" which covered 2 days' less time.

I have put "apportionment" in quotation marks because the proper understanding of this word is central to an understanding of my contention that subsection (h) has been violated. My point is this: As used in this act, an "apportionment" is more than a mere division of the money appropriated for the whole year. It is, rather, the sum necessary for any particular quarter so that the usual services provided by the Department may be carried on as provided by law. It is plain that the reductions in the fourth quarter by the adjustments set forth in the Comptroller General's letter, No. B-131361, dated April 12, 1957, resulted in the amount allocated to the fourth quarter being far too little to maintain the usual services in the sense just described. This is further borne out by the fact that the Postmaster General is pressing for a \$47 million deficiency appropriation so that he may maintain operations during this fourth quarter.

The whole matter boils down to the Postmaster General's willful and knowing violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act by purposefully refusing to apportion the appropriation money as required by law. It may be said that he did ask the Director of the Budget to approve supplemental appropriations and that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, through inexcusable ignorance with respect to the use of postal revenues, refused to transmit this information to Congress.

However, the Postmaster General well knew the antideficiency law and had ample opportunity between July 10, 1956, and the adjournment of Congress that year, as well as during the remainder of 1956, to contact the appropriate committees of the House to inform them of any additional needs so that the drastic curtailment now put into effect would not be necessary and so that the antideficiency law would be obeyed instead of flagrantly flouted and violated.

Federal Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL E. NEAL

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1957

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, those who oppose reducing the 1958 budget are just not responsive to general public opinion.

The progressive addition of bureaus and agencies calling for more Federal employees and annual increases in the cost of Government has aroused the people to the necessary tax burden that must be imposed on them to administer these programs.

Instead of continuing heavy taxes and spending to the limit of public forbearance, Government leaders might well read the signs of revolt so spontaneously generated by uniting their efforts to make this 1957 the year of the turning point from deficits and lavish indulgences.

Sensible reductions from amounts proposed by domestic Federal agencies, a more careful review of overlapping functions and waste in the Defense Department, and withdrawal of foreign aid from missions completing their assignments, can be the direct means of showing the folks back home that we are abandoning our disappointing experiences in assuming we can save the world.

It is traditional for heads of families and business organizations to periodically take account of capital depletion and correct unwarranted expenditures that endanger the safety and solvency of the financial structure.

The predicament of the United States Government, overdrawn, so to speak, in the sum of \$275 billion, still insisting on increased budgets with no assurances of diminishing national indebtedness and only an expression of hope for tax relief, should indicate the timeliness of a re-evaluation of our national financial prospects.

The American citizens have been extremely tolerant but that tolerance is waning. Let us recognize and profit by the warning before we encounter open revolt.

Area of Production Definitions and the Farmer's Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1957

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the farmer goes to the market place and asks: "What am I offered?"—for the American farmer must sell his product in the market and pay, in great part, for the processing of that product for market. The cotton farmer's price for his cotton must absorb the cost of ginning. The farmer cannot pass on to the consumer any increase in his cost of production.

When the wage and hour legislation was before Congress in 1938, Representatives from the Cotton Belt pointed out these facts to other Members of Congress. Congress realized that the cotton farmer had to pay the cost of the ginning and that to increase the cost of ginning would result in a reduction in the farmer's income. Accordingly, when it enacted the wage and hour legislation, Congress placed in the law an exemption applying not only to agricultural labor but in addition exempted the operations and processes involved in preparing for marketing and handling of agricultural commodities. This exemption is in section 3 of the act of 1938, as amended, and came to be known as the area of production clause.

However, despite the clear intent of Congress, the Secretary of Labor, through the definition of "area of production" has virtually nullified this exemption. So well have they drawn their definition that only 14 percent of the cotton gins in the Nation are exempt under this bureaucratic decree, and only 4 percent of the cotton compresses are eliminated from the provisions of the minimum wage and maximum hours law. Under the present departmental definition, and it will be remembered that earlier definitions issued by the Secretary have been condemned and nullified by the Federal courts, a cotton gin in a rural county in Arkansas is not considered as being in the area where cotton is raised if, first, more than 5 percent of the cotton received at the gin in any month was transported more than 10 miles from the farm, or, second, if the cotton gin is within 1 mile of a village having a population in excess of 2,500, or is within 3 miles of a city having a population of 50,000.

Another example to indicate the extent to which this definition has nullified the intent of Congress to exempt operations and processes involved in handling and preparing for market of agricultural commodities is the fact that cotton ware-

houses in the Cotton Belt which handle 94 percent of the cotton crop are not considered by the Department as being in the area where cotton is grown.

Only last year the Supreme Court denied a contention that poultry is not an agricultural commodity and, therefore, dressing and preparing poultry for market is not to be considered under this exemption.

Nor does the Department of Labor take into consideration new processes and techniques in preparing food for market. Canning of fruit and vegetables is exempt but the freezing of food is not. Today, great savings to the consumer have been effected by packing some vegetables in the field and hauling them to the packing sheds for precooling prior to shipment. But, this new technique is penalized by the Department, which has ruled that since the packing is done in the field the cooling operation is no longer exempt.

The following information, taken from official Government sources, shows graphically what has been happening to our farmers' income because of these increasing labor costs and processing charges:

[In billions of dollars]

Year	Gross farm income	Production expense	Labor cost of distributing products	Net farm income
1947.....	34.0	16.8	10.8	17.2
1948.....	34.6	18.6	11.8	15.9
1949.....	31.6	17.9	12.4	13.7
1950.....	32.1	19.2	13.0	12.9
1951.....	37.1	22.3	14.2	14.8
1952.....	36.7	22.5	15.1	14.3
1953.....	35.1	21.2	16.0	13.9
1954.....	33.5	21.4	16.5	12.0
1955.....	32.9	21.6	17.2	11.3
1956.....	34.0	22.1	(¹)	11.8

¹ Not available.

It is apparent that action must be taken to eliminate the Department of Labor's authority to restrict and nullify the intent of Congress. In the Senate S. 1418 has been introduced by Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi. This bill will re-emphasize the intent of Congress by defining the meaning of "agriculture," "first processing," and "area of production." Senator STENNIS would define the area of production to be "all of each county in which such commodity is produced in commercial quantities, except that it shall not include the corporate limits of a city or municipality having a population in excess of 250,000 as reported in the 1950 census."

In the interest of protecting the farmer's net income as well as assisting the American consuming public, this legislation should be adopted.

Reserve Officers' Retirement Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1957

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there is a real need for enactment of the Spark-

man-Jackson-Huddleston bill (S. 1085 and H. R. 689) which would specifically include Reserve officers for retirement pay under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942.

The latter bill referred to "any officer" who served in World War I as well as World War II and "is eligible for retirement." The current interpretation of the term "officer" to signify only Regular Army officers is unreasonable and unjust.

As an example of what type officer is being excluded by this discrimination against Reserve officers, I cite the case of an officer friend of mine. This officer has 43 years' creditable service for pay purposes. He served actively from 1912 to 1915 on the Mexican border, from 1917 to 1919 with the AEF in World War I, from 1942 to 1945 in World War II, and from 1952 to 1955 during the Korean crises. During all inbetween periods he was active in the Reserve Corps. He received the Legion of Merit in World War II. He was considered "essential" when recalled in 1952. At that time, at the age of 54, he gave up an excellent position as a top executive. He came back at age 57 to start, in effect, a new career. This type of uprooting and consequential readjustment to civilian life is a type of sacrifice unique to the Reserve officer in the Army.

Those officers, who maintained Active Reserve status between World Wars I and II, worked against odds to do so, and without compensation.

In interpreting the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, officers who were cadets at West Point during World War I, have just been ruled eligible on the basis that "any service" qualifies them, yet the term "any officer" is not interpreted to mean any officer other than Regulars.

I urge the enactment of the Sparkman-Jackson-Huddleston bill so that the inequitable situation, whereby the Reserve officer is excluded from the officer class, will be remedied.

Post Office Department Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY MCGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1957

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and possibly one or two more are playing politics with the Post Office Department's recommendations. I am sure the public will know of his actions and his refusal to give consideration to the request of the Postmaster General that an emergency exists.

I am reliably advised that the Postmaster General notified the proper department many months ago of the situation in which we now find ourselves. It is ridiculous, in my opinion, for the Congress to pass laws reclassifying and increasing expenditures of the Post Office Department and then to refuse to give the money to pay for those increases.

I sat in on a meeting a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, and our Postmaster General Summerfield had questions fired at him for over an hour. I might add that many of the questions did not come from so-called friends. The Postmaster General clearly demonstrated that he is a victim of politics, that just a few members of the New Deal and Democratic Party were trying to embarrass not only him but the Eisenhower administration as well.

Being granted permission to extend my remarks, I am including the following information given by the Postmaster General that I believe will be of interest:

How much does the Post Office Department spend in a year?

About \$3,250,000,000.

Seventy-eight and four-tenths percent for postal employees' salaries and fringe benefits set by Congress.

Fifteen and one-half percent for transportation of mail set by Government agencies.

One and eight-tenths percent for rents, utilities, and communication set by FCC.

Only 4.3 percent left for controllable items over which the Department really exercises any control.

Use money to print stamps, buy trucks, pens for 38,000 post offices, and hundreds of other items needed to operate post offices.

Why does the Post Office Department need \$47 million now?

To give accustomed service for the next 90 days.

None of this money to pay past bills.

Three reasons why it is costing more to give the American people the mail service they deserve, expect, and pay for:

1. More mail than estimated by about a billion pieces. And this increased volume of mail doesn't provide funds to operate the Post Office Department, since all revenues go directly to the Treasury Department.

2. Increased mail service to 1.3 million new homes.

3. Higher wages to employees by law.

All three of these reasons beyond control of the Department.

If the Post Office Department doesn't get the \$47 million, what can it do?

Required by law to live within the money Congress appropriates.

If Congress doesn't vote more money, must curtail mail service starting next Saturday, April 13.

Orders to go so already in hands of postmasters.

1. No Saturday mail deliveries.
2. Close post offices on Saturdays.
3. Less delivery service in business areas.
4. Close post offices earlier on weekdays.
5. Embargo third-class mail on April 29.
6. Stop the sale of money orders on April 29.

Obviously these drastic actions seriously hurt the economy of the Nation.

Has the Post Office Department ever asked for more money before?

Yes; but only once in past 4 years.

In 1956 needed and got \$166 million more, of which \$150 million was for pay increases under Public Law 68, effective March 1, 1955; the remaining \$16 million is the only supplemental appropriation the Department has received in 4 years for additional operating expenses.

However, in 2 other years spent less:

In 1954 turned back \$105 million.

In 1955 turned back almost \$50 million.

Are you cutting costs in the Post Office Department?

Yes. Now carrying 20 percent more mail with fewer employees than 6 years ago.

How many postal employees are there?

1952	523,757
1955	511,613
1956	508,587

How is mail volume increasing?

Pieces

Billion

1952	49.9
1956	58.4
1957 (estimated)	58.8
1958 (estimated)	59.7

Is the Post Office Department satisfied with mail service today?

Of course not.

Better than it was but still not good enough.

What is the Post Office Department doing to improve service?

Spending over \$4 million this year alone on research.

Set up first Office of Research and Engineering in history.

Working with nine engineering firms and Bureau of Standards.

Developing mechanical and electronic devices to speed mail through post offices.

Over 1,500 obsolete post offices replaced in past 4 years with new ones built by private capital.

Objective: Next day delivery of mail anywhere in the United States.

Governments South of the Border, Free and Otherwise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1957

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD in connection with Pan American Day, I am bringing the following list to the attention of my colleagues. It separates the practicing democracies and blatant dictatorships, with a third category consisting of countries striving to adopt democratic procedures but who for various reasons do not qualify as democracies at this time:

TYPES OF GOVERNMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA, MARCH 1957

I. DEMOCRACIES

1. Brazil.
2. Bolivia.
3. Chile.
4. Costa Rica.
5. Ecuador.
6. El Salvador.
7. Mexico.
8. Panama.
9. Peru.
10. Uruguay.

II. DICTATORSHIPS

1. Colombia (Rojas Pinilla).
2. Cuba (Batista).
3. Dominican Republic (Trujillo).
4. Nicaragua (Somoza).
5. Paraguay (Stroessner).
6. Venezuela (Perez Jimenez).

III. GOVERNMENTS FALLING BETWEEN THE EXTREMES OF POPULAR FREEDOM AND DICTATORIAL GOVERNMENT CONTROL

1. Argentina: Revolutionary government of General Aramburu has problem of recovery after 10 years of Perón dictatorship. Elections are promised for 1957.
2. Guatemala: Government of Castillo Armas which replaced Communist-infiltrated government [duly elected] of Arbenz has aroused criticism of even friends by repressive measures.

3. Haiti: President Magliore forced to resign in December after outburst of public discontent. Provisional government has scheduled elections tentatively for April.

4. Honduras: In October 1956 a liberal military junta seized power from an unpopular de facto government. The junta is committed to free elections and an eventual return to constitutional government. At present junta enjoys widespread popular support.

CBS Action Makes Case for FCC Network Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1957

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of our colleagues to the proposed action by Columbia Broadcasting System to discontinue its television affiliation with Charleston, W. Va.'s station WCHS-TV, the only operating television station in the capital city of my State. Columbia Broadcasting System has announced it will transfer its network affiliation to station WHTN-TV in Huntington, W. Va., which has just been purchased by the Cowles interests, "a big-business operation in the Midwest." The unfairness of such action is clearly evident in the following letter which I have forwarded to the president of CBS. The public interest may also be involved if the contemplated transfer is effected. The following editorial from the April 10, 1957, issue of the Charleston Gazette clearly points up the issue. The letter and editorial follow:

APRIL 10, 1957.

Dr. FRANK STANTON,
President, Columbia Broadcasting
System, Inc., New York, N. Y.

DEAR DR. STANTON: It has come to my attention that the Columbia Broadcasting System contemplates discontinuing its affiliation with Charleston, W. Va.'s only operating television station, WCHS-TV, and transferring its affiliation to WHTN-TV in Huntington. I understand that WCHS-TV has already been notified that its affiliation will be terminated on July 1, 1958, the expiration date of its contract with CBS.

I am quite familiar with the service being given by station WCHS-TV in Charleston, our State capital, which is the focal point for both State and Federal governmental activities in West Virginia. The Columbia Broadcasting System in having been affiliated with station WCHS-TV, has enjoyed the confidence and profound respect of the citizens of the area. The present facilities accommodate a very broad listening audience, and our capital and its people have been greatly benefited by the very adequate and complete services that have been rendered. In my opinion, no station could possibly provide better service than that being rendered to the public in the Charleston and immediately adjacent areas by station WCHS-TV. The transfer of network facilities from Charleston to a new station would deprive a rapidly growing industrial area of the kind of service it has been receiving and which it so rightly deserves. Unexcelled news service, national, State, and local, has been provided in the field of both radio and television by WCHS-TV, and Charleston has come

to accept it as one of the indispensable factors in the progress and development which have caused the Kanawha Valley to be so often spoken of as the "magic valley."

If the plan that has been announced by CBS is carried forth to completion, I have no doubt that the citizens of all of West Virginia will be justified in feeling that Charleston's local station has been exploited to satisfy big business and absentee ownership. It would be said indeed if this should be the situation, because it is in just such situations that Government control, so often and so vociferously deplored in this day and age, is invited.

Charleston's station WCHS-TV is about to complete the construction of a new high tower erected at a cost of over \$300,000. The location and the construction of the tower were approved by the engineering department of Columbia Broadcasting System. It would seem to me that CBS would be morally obligated to continue its affiliation with the Charleston station, now that WCHS-TV has gone to the trouble and expense of building the new tower. Transmittal of pictures via the new tower is expected to begin on May 1. The station constructed the tower in good faith in order to improve and expand its coverage. Instead of waiting until the station could have an opportunity to prove the performance of the new tower, CBS has arbitrarily announced that it will transfer network facilities to the Huntington area as soon as the present contract runs its course.

Dr. Stanton, I cannot help but be greatly disturbed about the action contemplated. I represent the congressional district in which Charleston is located. Mine is the greatest coal-producing district in the United States, and in the Kanawha Valley you will find one of the largest concentrations of chemical plants in the Western Hemisphere. It seems little short of ridiculous that the city in which is located the seat of State government, situated in such a large industrial and heavily populated area, is about to be deprived of its CBS outlet. I realize that the matter is one over which I have no direct supervision or control, but as Representative of an area which will be most vitally and injuriously affected, I cannot, in good conscience, avoid protesting the action being proposed. I am advised that the owners of television sets will be put to additional expense for purchase of new antennas, and I should think that CBS would be most reluctant to cause this additional burden to be placed upon the public. Moreover, the public has a natural, and, indeed, vested interest in retaining the outlet in Charleston, and I am at a loss to understand why the facilities should be moved to another community which already possesses the outlet of another leading network, namely, NBC.

I trust, Dr. Stanton, that the proposed action, although already announced, will not be consummated. Local ownership has been recognized by the Federal Government as being the type of ownership which renders the most complete public service to the people. The people of West Virginia too long have suffered from out-of-State ownership of many of the industrial enterprises, and we look jealously and with askance upon the decision by CBS to weld another shackle and place another millstone around the neck of local ownership as is being done in this instance. I sincerely hope that reason and justice will prevail and that the Columbia Broadcasting System will not terminate its affiliation with WCHS-TV.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD,
Member of Congress.

CBS ACTION MAKES CASE FOR FCC NETWORK CONTROL

The decision of the Columbia Broadcasting System to switch its television affiliation

from WCHS, Charleston, to WHTN, Huntington, raises two rather astounding points:

1. That an organization of the supposed business sense of CBS would make such a decision in the first place; and

2. That the Federal Communications Commission, which has the power to regulate individual television stations down to the finest detail, has no control whatsoever over the giant networks.

On point 1, except for a business obligation to do the best possible job for its stockholders and what some may hold to be an obligation to the viewing public, we suppose the CBS decisions in such matters are its own business.

But on point 2, it seems to be astonishingly inconsistent that Congress would give the FCC control over individual stations, which would be in the relative category of small business and give an absolute free hand to the networks, which are big business with the power to make or break an individual station.

And nothing does more to emphasize this inequity than the case at hand, which we consider to be an unfair, arbitrary, and unreasonable action on the part of CBS to give one television station a great advantage at the expense of another.

It can hardly be denied that network affiliation is a big factor in the value of a local station. Thus, looking at it in the cold light of cash value, the CBS decision will be highly beneficial to WHTN and somewhat detrimental to WCHS just as it would have had a similar effect on the stations concerned if NBC had decided to switch from WSAZ to WHTN.

Therefore, it seems rather significant that the CBS decision came shortly after WHTN, admittedly a weak third station in the Charleston-Huntington area, was purchased by the Cowles interests, a big business operation in the Midwest.

Is this a case of CBS, which is big business itself bowing to the demands of big business in the ownership of individual television stations?

And, with this switch in network affiliation, what happens to the value of the stock of WHTN, which certainly must have been acquired by Cowles at a modest price?

The only reasons made public by CBS for its decision were that it wanted to be in a more competitive position with NBC's Huntington outlet, WSAZ, and that Cowles had done an outstanding job of management in other cities.

But CBS prefers to ignore the advances made by WCHS after its main competition had a 5-year advantage in getting on the air, and the effort and expense to which it has gone to improve the CBS competitive position.

The thing that makes the CBS action so unfair, and casts suspicions upon the motives involved, is that the decision was made just before WCHS is to put in use its new transmitting tower which it is building at a cost of \$300,000 to improve its competitive position.

Both WCHS and WHTN are in the process of building new towers. Therefore, if CBS had any interest in being fair in its consideration of affiliates, we contend that it would have waited until it could have had a firsthand comparison of the two stations on their performance with their new transmitters.

Instead, CBS arbitrarily announces its decision to kick its old friend, WCHS, off to the side and embrace an untired but wealthy newcomer.

Such an action certainly causes suspicions and raises questions that should be subject to review by the Federal Communications Commission.

In the public interest, Congress should do something to prevent this dog-eat-dog principle of permitting the big to swallow up the small.

Middle East Development Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1957

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the clearest and best-informed voices in the field of American foreign policy today is that of Minnesota's great Senator, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. Always a forceful and articulate spokesman, Senator HUMPHREY is also a keen student of foreign relations. As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he has frequently offered incisive criticism and constructive suggestions in such a manner as to place all those who believe in peace in his debt. Knowing of his special interest in the crucial area of the Middle East, I have asked unanimous consent that an address which he delivered in New York City on April 10 be included in the RECORD.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY ON
THE MIDDLE EAST DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
(MEDA)

Tonight I want to explore with you some further thoughts on a subject I first broached here in New York on December 20 in a speech I made at the Overseas Press Club. At that time I said:

"It might be useful . . . to consider establishing, under United Nations auspices, a Middle East Development Authority. Most of the economic, as well as the other, problems of the area are international in their scope. Most of them also require outside assistance, either in the form of capital, of technical aid, or of good offices. Why not, then, have an international agency to deal with them? The kind of Middle East Development Authority that I have in mind would have on its board of directors representatives of all the states of the area, as well as representatives of the states furnishing capital and technical assistance. Ample provision could be made to protect national sovereignties."

In the past few months since I made that suggestion, I have been spending a good deal of time thinking about the proposal in more detail. Among the various proposals which others have made and which are entirely consistent with my own suggestion, is one in particular which I should like to bring to your attention. It originated in the London Economist last August 4, at the start of the Suez crisis. The Economist called for "a permanent international zone to consist of the Gaza Strip, plus a narrow strip of Egyptian Sinai running all down the frontier to the Gulf of Aqaba south of Israel's Red Sea outlet at Eilat, plus the Island of Tiran at the mouth of the gulf." The Economist proposed that "this area should be available for the passage of oil pipelines, air, and land traffic—in fact, all international communications agreeable to the United Nations."

I believe that this proposal should be given more consideration. Even on its own merits, such a strip would form a buffer zone making it possible for both Egypt and Israel to reduce their military expenditures. Unlike most international transfers of land, it would displace no settled nationals of any country. Operating in conjunction with a Middle East Development Authority, the project could indeed provide new employment to many of the 200,000 Arab refugees in the Gaza Strip.

Of course, there is the possibility—perhaps the probability—that intense negotiations

would have to take place before both Egypt and Israel would accept this proposal. We need to be bold. But there are advantages in it for both. As one bargaining point in negotiations, I would even be willing to consider the possibility which has up to now been unacceptable to the Israelis: namely, the possibility of an internationally administered and guaranteed corridor across the Negev which would provide land communications between Egypt and Jordan. Such a corridor could in turn be used as a quid pro quo both for an additional international corridor across the Sinai Peninsula and for Arab guarantees of free Israeli passage through the Straits of Tiran and the Suez Canal.

Whether or not some modification of this plan for the internationalization of territory can be worked out, the parallel proposal of a Middle East Development Authority still seems to me to be a significant and hopeful one. We should give it the highest priority in a dramatic effort to break the accumulated logjam of frustration and bitterness in the Middle East.

Nowhere on earth can a better case be made than in the Middle East for a regional approach to the basic necessity for economic development. Most if not all of the vexing, complicated tensions of the area are involved with, and partly dependent upon, present economic conditions and future economic prospects in the area.

A Middle East Development Authority (MEDA), representing all the states in the region as well as of other states furnishing capital and technical assistance, could be a decisive new element in the whole situation. It seems to me that such an authority could be the catalytic agent which is now so desperately needed to precipitate solutions for a host of other Middle East problems.

As I now see it, MEDA itself would be a kind of hybrid between the World Bank and the TVA. It could undertake projects itself. It could lend money to either private or public agencies. It could participate in equity financing, in the manner of the International Finance Corporation. It could actively manage projects. It could carry on scientific research (in such matters as soil fertility, geological surveys, etc.). It could make basic engineering surveys and contribute to the drawing up of overall regional development plans. Furthermore, it could carry on long-term technical assistance—directed and staffed by the people of the area—for the people of the area.

The advantages of such an authority are really exciting. Just to consider a few of the possibilities:

1. MEDA could divert the attention of Arab leaders from military adventures to internal economic development. Turning Arab energies into constructive channels would eventually lead to institutional and social changes, such as the growth of a middle class, which would have a beneficial energizing and yet stabilizing influence.

2. MEDA could provide a means of channeling Arab oil revenue into productive uses which would benefit the entire area, thus utilizing part of the presently existing hard-money resources of the Middle East for the financing of regional development.

3. MEDA could be an international entity with which the states of the area could carry on bilateral negotiations and bilateral economic agreements. At present, it would be fanciful to expect Israel and Egypt to agree with each other. But it would perhaps not be so fanciful to expect them to agree separately with someone else.

4. MEDA could ultimately provide a solution to the whole Palestine-Arab refugee problem. This problem is supposed to be dealt with by the U. N. Relief and Works Agency, but UNRWA's activities have been limited almost solely to relief. The only long-term solution for the refugees is basic economic development for the area as a whole—the kind of development which will

make it possible for the area to support more people at a higher standard of living.

5. MEDA might provide the political and economic formula for the acceptance of the Jordan River plan. MEDA itself could manage the project. This would also have advantages because an international agency would be less suspect of giving one side or the other more or less than its fair share of irrigation water or of power.

6. MEDA could give technical assistance and supervised farm credit to farmers settling on new lands coming into production from the development of the Jordan, the Litani, the Euphrates, or the Nile.

I appreciate the fact that there would be very serious practical problems as to how MEDA could be established and financed. In the present circumstances in the area, these problems may prove insuperable. For this reason, it is probably wise not to attempt to outline MEDA's charter and functions in precise detail, but to leave plenty of room for negotiation and compromise as developments indicate. Great care must be taken not to give MEDA the appearance of a supranational authority which would impinge upon the sovereignties of the states of the area. All chances of Egyptian participation, especially, would be lost if MEDA were put forward as an international agency to operate the Suez Canal.

To meet these objections, ample provisions for the protection of national sovereignties would have to be written into MEDA's charter. Further protection would be offered by the fact that all participating states would be represented on MEDA's Board of Directors.

Care would also have to be taken that MEDA did not become an instrument for furthering the Arab economic boycott of Israel. At the same time, the project would probably fail if the Arabs viewed it as an instrument designed especially for breaking their boycott. The avoidance of both of these pitfalls will require a fine degree of diplomatic tightrope walking, and determination to come to grips with the problems.

It is important to recognize that progress toward political stability and economic development in the Middle East can only be made slowly, one step at a time. It is impractical to try to work out an overall political settlement and economic development plan in a single package. It is imperative, however, that some kind of a start be made. Once this is done, the economic and social consequences will themselves generate a kind of momentum that will lead to further progress. For example, one cannot realistically expect the establishment of full trade relations between Israel and the Arab States in one step. But one can, perhaps, expect some kind of an arrangement, with MEDA or a similar agency acting as an intermediary, whereby joint water-use rights, for example, can be established. And one can also expect one thing to lead to another. Economic contact has a way of stimulating further activity.

In all of this, it is of the greatest importance that economics and politics be sharply separated. Economic development and political stability are, of course, closely related, and it is a close question as to which comes first. But one of the difficulties with the American foreign economic assistance program has been that it has been too much concerned with political conditions and too little concerned with economic conditions. The result, in many cases, is that the program has been counterproductive politically and a failure economically.

If there is a new international agency for economic development in the Middle East, or if the United States continues its own bilateral programs, the problem should be approached on an economic basis. The character of the international agency should forbid the use of political considerations, and the

United States should renounce such use. On the other hand, the most rigid economic criteria should be established and adhered to.

What we have got to get across to everybody concerned in the Middle East is that it is in their own interests to turn their attention from intraregional feuding to intraregional development. This is true of both Israel and the Arab States. Israel has a per capita gross national product approximately twice that of Lebanon, the richest Arab state, and approximately 4 or 5 times that of most of the other Arab states. Just as it is unhealthy, and indeed dangerous, for the United States to live as an island of wealth in a sea of poverty, so is it unhealthy and even more dangerous for Israel to do so.

This is not to suggest an Israeli aid program for the Arab States. But it is to suggest that Israel has responsibilities toward the Arabs, particularly in terms of compensating the Arab refugees and providing for at least token resettlement in Israel.

The Arab States likewise have responsibilities toward Israel, the most important of which is to recognize Israel's right to independent existence and peace.

The Arabs frequently complain about the disparity in American aid to Israel as compared to the Arab States. What is frequently overlooked is that American aid has been better used and has been more effective in Israel than in almost any other country of the Afro-Asian region. The economic transformation which Israel underwent between 1952 and 1955 is as dramatic as that which occurred in Western Europe under the stimulus of the Marshall plan—yes; even more so.

The plain economic truth is that comparable amounts of aid poured into the Arab States would have produced by no means comparable results. In Israel, the aid program was dealing with a skilled, literate population with workable social and political institutions which are a prerequisite to economic development. These same conditions do not exist in the Arab States. This is not a reason for withholding aid to Arab States; but it is an additional reason for undertaking, multilaterally, and on a regional basis, fundamental development projects in the Arab States. The need is great—the possibilities challenging.

Total United States aid to Israel and the Arab States has amounted to more than \$600 million. Except in Israel, it has not been particularly effective. The total that can be usefully expended over the next 10 years will almost certainly be no more than \$600 million—let's say \$1 billion at the most. If a regional development agency like MEDA could be created and given a capital of approximately this amount, the United States would be called upon to contribute only a portion of the total. In addition, the chances of successful economic development would be considerably improved.

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ECONOMIC RELATIONS

What I have just said about the importance of Israel as a symbol for economic development in the whole Middle East area only further serves to emphasize the importance of close, continued United States-Israel economic relations. Your own Chamber is dedicated to the promotion of these relations, through the publication of your News Bulletin and Monthly Journal; your regular and special meetings of businessmen; your market research; the finding of agents here for Israeli products and in Israel for American products; your advice to investors; your assistance in licensing arrangements, and the many other valuable services you are performing.

I know that your 10-year program aims at sustaining and increasing United States-Israel economic relations and calls for economic activity totalling \$1,500,000,000 over the 10 year period since your founding in 1953. I rejoice with you that economic activity between the two countries is increas-

ing, in spite of diminishing official United States economic aid to Israel.

On that subject, let me say a bit more. United States economic aid to Israel reached its peak in fiscal year 1953 (\$70 million), and has been decreasing since then. Last year it was \$25 million, but was augmented by some \$25 million in surplus foodstuffs.

This form of aid promotes United States exports to Israel, usually to an extent larger than the aid amount itself. This help, of great value to Israel, has also helped establish United States leadership in Israel's markets.

I know that you have heard talk of renewing such aid now that Israel's troop withdrawals have occurred. I know that the hundreds of United States business firms trading with Israel, are anxious to know: (a) When will the aid be renewed, and (b) What amount of aid is being considered.

I am glad to say that I have reason to believe that the Israeli aid program will be resumed in the near future. As you know, mutual security aid for fiscal 1957 was planned at about the level of \$25 million for Israel. I believe that when the program is resumed, it will be reinstated at about that same level.

You will also remember that a United States Export-Import Bank loan to Israel of \$75 million was under negotiation last year, to assist Israel's agricultural development. The grant of the loan would have meant much export business for the United States, no doubt over and above the \$75 million loaned.

The Export-Import Bank announced last October 11 that a delegation from the bank would leave for Israel to examine the development program and clear the way for granting the loan. The outbreak of fighting negated this mission.

Since Israel's withdrawal there have been rumors that the negotiations for the loan are being resumed and I can assure you that some of us have been urging, and will continue to urge with all the force at our command, the renewal of these negotiations.

OIL PIPELINES

Many of us have been following closely the developments in the two Israeli pipeline projects now in process, as well as the third which is still in the planning stage.

I appreciate the fact that our Government has not been requested to assist in the financing of any of these projects, but I am afraid the reason is what the Israelis consider to be a predictable disinterest on our part. I should like to see us take an active interest, and offer to help. The oil pipeline situation in Israel at the moment is itself another story of imagination and initiative on the part of those pioneering people.

The first pipeline, a purely domestic project, calls for the construction of an 8-inch pipeline from Ellat—on the Gulf of Aqaba—to the railhead of Beersheba. This line will be capable of carrying about two-thirds of the country's oil needs, or roughly 800,000 metric tons a year. Construction of this pipeline was undertaken from domestic resources, with pipe already in the country and the preliminary technical survey was done by Tahal, the Israel water planning company. To put the line in operation by the target date of April 15, Israel must bring to rapid completion 2 pumping stations with double pumps—one located at Ellat and the other about 100 kilometers north of that port. Israeli press reports indicate one of these stations was completed by the middle of March. The oil will be transported by rail from Beersheba to the Haifa refinery which has an annual capacity of 4 million tons. This pipeline of 240 kilometers will cost about \$6.7 million.

In the meantime, another project which is about to commence is for a 16-inch pipeline from Beersheba to the Mediterranean coast—in the neighborhood of Wadi Suk-

heir (about 30 kilometers south of Tel Aviv) with the oil transported by sea tanker to Haifa. The 16-inch line from Beersheba to Wadi Sukheir will be 60 kilometers in length.

Israel is also seeking financing for a 32-inch pipeline to carry 25 million tons of oil a year from Ellat to a location somewhere along the Mediterranean coast. The pipeline will be 180 or 270 miles long, depending upon the location of its Mediterranean terminal, and may require something in the order of \$60 million. According to Israeli reports, surveys of this line have begun, with the help of French engineers. This project would be an international pipeline and is intended as Israel's answer to the Suez problem. Israelis say that they prefer private enterprise financing of this project. At one point, the French Government announced it would finance its construction but this appears to have fallen through. Whether this project can be realized remains to be seen. It, too, may depend on what we do.

Here, as on other issues, it is important to remind ourselves in conclusion that what happens to Israel happens to freedom. America and the entire free world are inextricably involved in the fate of Israel. We must frankly come to recognize that whatever happens to this struggling country happens to the forces of freedom everywhere.

If this outpost of democracy suffers, the free world suffers with her. As a result, far more than the fate of one nation, as vital as that is, is involved in the future of the Middle East.

Israel ought to and does represent and exemplify America's foreign policy objectives. Our goals for a free and peaceful world include development of responsible governments, the correction of ancient social and economic inequalities, the determined use of modern skills and technical skills for economic progress, and the opening of new horizons for the human personality. When we look at the Middle East today, where but in Israel do we find these goals being realized in daily performance? Israel is an exemplification of liberal democracy, in an area needing a beacon of democracy.

We have a vital stake in keeping that beacon glowing.

The Federal Flood Insurance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 15, 1957

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, I have been endeavoring to determine the reasons for the delay in the issuance of flood insurance policies to those who desire to purchase them. I have found that the delay was caused first by the administrative details which had to be ironed out before rates could be established, policies drafted and claims procedures established.

The administrative work has been completed now and excellent procedures have been developed under which extremely reasonable rates are proposed for policies which you will be able to purchase from your own insurance agent wherever you live. Fire and casualty insurance companies will issue the contracts and collect fees and losses will be handled through independent claims adjustment facilities.

I was delighted to learn of the excellent job which had been done but my spirits were dampened when I learned that the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration has been unable to get the Appropriations Committee to budget the \$50 million which will be necessary. Members of the committee tell me that the States have indicated little interest and that the demand for the insurance on the part of individual homeowners is below expectations. The committee apparently has balked because of the campaign for economy and the whole program is in danger of collapse—this is shocking, but true.

The \$50 million to which I have referred is not to be spent each year, and is necessary for two principal purposes: First, for subsidy premium payments into the reserve fund, and secondly, for payments to agents, carriers, and loss adjusters for their expenses and services. Obviously, if the Government sells an insurance policy and a loss occurs, the Government has a legal obligation to pay the loss, therefore a reserve fund must be set up. The program will be self-supporting, but, like any private insurance company, the Government must have money to start.

During the 84th Congress I was privileged to participate as a cosponsor with Senator Herbert H. Lehman and others in the first flood-insurance program ever established in the United States.

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY said, on March 21 on the floor of the Senate, that—

The Nation's first flood-insurance program, in the shaping of which I was privileged to participate, was one of our proudest accomplishments in the last session of Congress. It was intended to fulfill a dire need on the part of homeowners and businessmen in all parts of the country, including New England. It was promptly considered and passed by both Houses of Congress, and swiftly approved by the President, because of the urgent need for such legislation before disaster struck again.

Now, nearly a year later, as New Englanders and others prepare for the consequences of spring and melting snows, what has happened to this program? No protection is available, no insurance can be purchased, no regulations have been published, no final policy forms have been agreed upon. Excessive bureaucratic delay, undue reliance upon a private insurance industry whose attitude has been negative from the beginning, and a diminution of popular interest as the result of restrictions, have all contributed to this administrative failure.

Senator KENNEDY puts his finger on one of the major reasons for the failure of the program to date. He said:

One of those legislative problems—the necessity of obtaining a special appropriation for administrative expenses—would not have occurred had the administration accepted the provision in my original bill for such expenditure to be made from program funds, which come from a Treasury revolving-loan fund. But once the present provision was enacted, the new Federal Flood Indemnity Administration was negligent in failing to submit a budget request in time for inclusion in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, already passed by the Congress.

I have joined with Senator KENNEDY in sponsoring legislation to amend the present Federal Flood Insurance Act of

1956. My bill, H. R. 6334, was introduced on March 25, 1957.

I include here the text of H. R. 6334, together with a letter I have received from the Commissioner of the Flood Indemnity Administration. I feel both of these items will be of considerable interest to my colleagues:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 4 of the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 is amended by striking out all that follows the colon and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That in the processing of applications for insurance under this act, the Administrator shall give priority to applications from persons who are not then protected against loss due to flood under any insurance provided by the Administrator under this act."

(b) Section 7 (a) of such act is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

(c) Section 15 of such act is amended—

(1) by striking out in the first sentence of subsection (b) the following: "and the contributions made by the Administrator and the respective States in accordance with section 7 (a) of this act"; and

(2) by striking out the last sentence of subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Funds may be borrowed under this section at such times as may be deemed necessary by the Administrator, and funds so borrowed shall be deposited, in such proportions as the Administrator deems advisable, in the disaster insurance fund, the disaster reinsurance fund, and the disaster loan fund."

(d) Section 21 of such act is amended by striking out the second sentence thereof.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
FEDERAL FLOOD INDEMNITY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 11, 1957.

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: This is in answer to the inquiry from your office yesterday about the current status of the Federal flood indemnity program.

On March 12, 1957, the President transmitted to the Speaker of the House proposals for supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1957, in which \$50 million was requested for the operations of the Federal flood indemnity program. This amount is composed primarily of two items: One for subsidy premium payments into the reserve fund (disaster insurance fund); and the other for payments to agents, insurance carriers and loss adjusters as reimbursement for their expenses and services. You realize, I am sure, that this money can only be used as the business develops. Obviously, if we sell an insurance policy and a loss occurs, the Government has a legal obligation to adjust the loss and an adjuster must be paid. The same is true for agents who sell the policy and carriers who issue it in our behalf and perform accounting and statistical services. Until money is appropriated by the Congress for this purpose, we cannot legally incur these obligations.

The request is now before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the House Committee on Appropriations. Since the Federal Flood Insurance Act requires that all administrative costs, including payments to the insurance industry for selling and servicing this insurance, must be paid from appropriated funds, the date that we can offer this insurance to the American public is directly related to the action of the Congress. When Congress appropriates these funds, we can shortly thereafter commence issuing insurance policies.

By way of background, you will recall that the 84th Congress enacted the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 on the closing day of the session and it was signed into law by President Eisenhower on August 7, 1956.

Acting under the authority of this act, Administrator Albert M. Cole established the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration as a constituent unit of the Housing and Home Finance Agency on September 28, 1956. On the same date, I was appointed Commissioner of FFIA.

Some of the potentially difficult administrative problems of establishing a new program lent themselves to prompt solutions. Acting under the authority of the act to utilize the private insurance industry to the maximum practicable extent, we have been able to lay out a marketing plan that contemplates maximum use of private facilities: Insurance agents and brokers throughout the country will sell Federal flood-indemnity contracts; fire and casualty insurance companies will issue the contracts and collect fees; and losses will be handled by independent claim-adjustment facilities. The marketing arrangements we have made will enable persons or corporate bodies to purchase flood-indemnity contracts in their own communities from the same agents or brokers who sell fire and casualty insurance.

We have been successful in negotiating with the insurance companies to have their services and facilities made available to us at cost; without profit or allowance for administrative expenses or other expenses normally incident to the operation of their business. These operations will be subject, of course, to our supervision and control.

After months of intensive efforts, we are now completing final drafts of the flood-indemnity contracts, underwriting rules and regulations, loss adjustment procedures and accounting and statistical forms and regulations, as well as completing the rate structure. Net rates (after the application of subsidy) will range for the major classes of our risks from approximately \$1 to \$2.50 per hundred of insurance on an 80-percent co-insurance basis.

Since you were so closely connected with the legislation which created the flood-indemnity program, you know that flood insurance for fixed-location property has never been generally available to the American people. Because of the high risk and catastrophic nature of floods, private companies have declined to offer this form of insurance.

This meant that we were charged with the responsibility for writing flood insurance without any prior flood-insurance experience to draw upon for ratemaking and underwriting. However, we had to comply with provisions of the act which specified that rates shall be established which would produce sufficient proceeds to pay all claims for probable losses over a reasonable period of years, shall be based on consideration of the risks involved, and that the fees to be charged the purchasers of indemnity contracts shall be designed to achieve marketability.

We attacked the rate problem by calling on the services of two groups of specialists. One was a committee of highly competent rate experts from the insurance industry. The other was an interagency committee of the Federal Government, including engineers and hydrologists from the Weather Bureau, the United States Geological Survey, and the Corps of Engineers.

Each committee, working separately, came up with a different rating system. The industry suggested rates which would be applicable nationally. These rates would take into consideration, among other things, (1) the location of the property, whether over water (such as piers, wharves, and similar facilities) or not; (2) whether insurance covered only the building or the building and its contents; (3) the location of the contents within the building; (4) whether or not the insured desired to take advantage of coinsurance or contribution provisions; and (5) dollar and percentage deductibles.

The Government group suggested rates based on hydrological data and the mathematical probability of floods. This system

would establish rates on the basis of location alone, that is, elevation and distance from the exposure, and upon the probability of a flood of a certain discharge at that site. These data, it was proposed, were to be used to develop contour maps which would indicate flood frequency, magnitude and intensity, and thus an average risk for property within prescribed zones shown on the map. This method is time consuming and expensive and not practicable for immediate use.

We have given both these systems exhaustive study and have arrived at a method which we feel combines the best features of each. We propose to adopt the general approach suggested by the insurance industry, but have modified it by considerations of flood frequency and damage in different areas.

By using the best data available, we have established a separate set of rates for each major river basin in the United States and for the more highly exposed areas along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts. We feel that the rates as now established meet the requirements of the act, including marketability.

I share with you and your constituents the concern over the need for protection against future flood losses, and I assure you that we are making every effort to offer flood insurance as soon as possible after the appropriated funds become available.

I trust that this answers your inquiry. If you have need for any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me again. Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. MEISTRELL,
Commissioner, Flood Indemnity Administration.

Asian Assembly for Moral Rearmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 15, 1957

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there has just been completed in the Philippines an Asian Assembly for Moral Re-Armament attended by representative leaders from 27 nations. This assembly was welcomed to his country by the late President Magsaysay, and was attended by his successor, President Garcia, with members of his Cabinet.

We in Washington would be wise to take note of what has been done and said at this gathering. The reconciliation of bitterness between races and nations, the demonstration of moral and spiritual power in men who can decide policy, the implications for the United States of this new understanding among the free nations of Asia—these are all matters of the highest significance.

Freedom has its ideology. Absolute moral standards give it firmness. The spirit of God gives it life.

If we in America live that ideology we shall find a response in Asia that money cannot buy. It could be the turning point.

The signs of response to these deeper realities at this assembly are a source of hope for us all—and a challenge to us to examine our policy and our practice in light of these truths.

Mr. President, I ask that a statement I have prepared on this subject be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASIAN ASSEMBLY FOR MORAL REARMAMENT—STATESMEN UNITE AT MRA ASSEMBLY IN THE PHILIPPINES

President Carlos P. Garcia of the Philippines and Mrs. Garcia, with members of his Cabinet and leaders of the Philippine Congress, traveled by special train to Baguio to welcome delegates from 27 nations to the Asian Assembly for Moral Re-Armament held March 29-April 8. President Garcia said: "I am glad that Moral Re-Armament was born. It is sounding a chord that will find responsive hearts the world over."

The Presidential party included the Acting Secretary of Foreign Affairs, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the chairman of the Senate Committee on National Defense, as well as other members of the Cabinet and chairmen of congressional committees.

The Manila Times reported that President Garcia went to fulfill a date made by the late President Magsaysay. Speaking of the late President, Senator Roseller Lim said:

"Since his breakfast a year ago with Dr. Frank Buchman, initiator of Moral Re-Armament," the President said at least three times, "Ros, we must decide this on the basis of what's right, no matter whose feelings are hurt, even my own." On that basis many of the President's problems were solved. Five days before his death I told him about this Assembly. He said he would come to Baguio to open the conference, and expressed the particular hope that the three Colwell brothers would be coming."

Senator Emmanuel Pelaez, chairman of the Senate Committee on National Defense in the Philippines, said:

"It is for practical reasons that I want MRA to be a force here. From the standpoint of national security it can be a very practical, realistic bulwark against the infiltration of communism."

ONLY ANSWER A SUPERIOR IDEOLOGY

The former Prime Minister of Nationalist China, Gen. Ho Ying-chin, now chairman of the Military Strategy Advisory Board of Taiwan, summing up the results of the conference, declared that what he and others had "failed to achieve in 10 years of postwar diplomatic effort had been accomplished at this Asian Assembly."

"Although the war ended over 10 years ago, deep bitterness has remained. I see Moral Re-Armament as the ideology which is uniting the Asian nations. Real contributions have been made to the welfare of Asia. Leading Japanese and Koreans have found understanding. We have seen a dream of long standing realized here. Enemies have become reconciled and great hope has been found."

"Today we need a superior ideology to safeguard our national freedom and democracy. Dr. Frank Buchman, from his knowledge of human nature, foresaw this need and has given the world an ideology of change. Twenty years' experience of communism has proved to me that the only answer is a superior ideology. Today there is only one road—that of Moral Re-Armament—along which the whole world can advance to freedom and peace."

Gen. Ho Ying-chin pledged himself to accept gladly any responsibility through Moral Re-Armament to consolidate this new spirit in Asia and the world.

PRIME MINISTER U NU DEFINES BASIS OF ANSWERING IDEOLOGIES

The Burmese Prime Minister sent a message to the assembly which was broadcast

"On July 1, 1956, President Magsaysay awarded to Dr. Frank Buchman the Order of the Philippines Legion of Honor with Gold Medal.

over the Burmese National Radio: "Dr. Buchman has presented to the world a new ideology above race and class because it seeks to answer the needs of the heart. This ideology seeks to change men, their ideas, their motives, their aims. Its moral standards of honesty, purity, unselfishness, and love form the cream of all religious beliefs."

Prime Minister Nobosuke Kishi of Japan said in a message delivered by Niro Hoshijima: "I look forward to the day when all the peoples of Asia unite in friendship. This desire of mine makes me exceptionally happy to send my greetings to the Asian Conference for Moral Re-Armament. Understanding between nations can hardly be realized by the official phase of diplomacy alone. What appears to me vastly more important is a reawakening to the moral and spiritual values involved."

Dr. Mohammad Hatta, former vice president and cofounder of the Indonesia Republic, sent a message declaring: "If with God's help you can achieve something to alleviate world tension, the whole of mankind will be grateful to you."

R. P. Sunarto, a director of Radio Indonesia, delivered Dr. Hatta's message and told of the widespread response to weekly broadcasts on MRA in Indonesia.

President Ngo Dinh Diem of Vietnam sent a personal representative, Dinh Van Huan, first president of the court of appeals. Mr. Van Huan said: "To remake the world we only need a determined nucleus in every country. I am deeply convinced of the objectives for which you are so effectively striving. An Asian Assembly for Moral Re-Armament should be held at least once a year."

HISTORIC HATREDS HEALED

Niro Hoshijima, cosignatory of the Japanese Peace Treaty and oldest member of the Diet in point of service, said: "Relations between Japan and our nearest neighbor, Korea, are not what they should be. This is primarily the responsibility of the Japanese. Here we have been able to find the road to unity between Korea and Japan. With the spirit of MRA Japan can change and we can find lasting unity with the countries of Asia."

Yoon Sung Soon, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Korean National Assembly, said: "The real difficulties between Korea and Japan can only be solved through the spirit of Moral Re-Armament. We need to change personally, but it also needs to issue in political, social, economic, and international changes. I have to change and every nation has to change. Just as Korea and Japan have found unity through MRA, so too can every nation."

Senator Shidzue Kato, member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Japanese Diet, asking forgiveness of the Korean people who suffered under more than 30 years of Japanese occupation, said: "I want to take full responsibility for what my nation did and for this I ask your forgiveness. I return with the determination that it will not just be lip service to an apology but to fight that this spirit becomes the policy of my nation."

Mrs. Park Hyun Sook, former Korean Cabinet Minister whom the Japanese had imprisoned for years and whose husband had been bedridden for more than 18 years as a result of Japanese maltreatment, said: "The unity of Asia can only be achieved when there is reconciliation between Japan and Korea. Through change in my own heart I lost my enmity and I am convinced that only on the basis of MRA can permanent peace be achieved in Asia and the world."

Senator Kato, in describing how the reparations agreement between the Philippines and Japan was ratified, said: "Before I met MRA I was champion in embarrassing the government to get my name before the public. But MRA taught me how to fight on

the basis of what is right. Last June the Diet was considering ratification of our reparations agreement with the Philippines but this was endangered by our party's opposition to the Government and the many conflicts in the Diet. I decided to take full responsibility as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee to fight for ratification, and 3 hours before the Diet session ended the reparations agreement was ratified."

Daw Nyeln Tha, distinguished educator from Burma, said: "MRA has the secret of turning enemies into friends." She quoted Dr. Buchman: "The best defense of your country is the respect and gratitude of your neighbors."

Mr. Kichizaemon Sumitomo, head of the Japanese industrial family which before the war employed 500,000 men, said: "I realize that as a capitalist I was also responsible for what happened in the Philippines by providing the material strength for the Japanese militarists. But apology is not enough. We in management must work on a basis of what is right. It is not enough to rely on good will between individuals. We responsible leaders of our nations must commit ourselves to living a moral ideology."

After an apology by Renzo Yanagisawa, chairman of 250,000 Japanese shipyard workers, for what Japan did to the Philippines during the war, Donato Alarcon, vice president of the Philippine Transport Workers Union, said: "At this assembly we are developing the moral ideology where our mistakes of the past can be corrected and Japan and the Philippines can learn to live as members of one family."

Willard Johnson, president of the student body of 12,000 at the University of California at Los Angeles, and Jerry Nelson, another student leader from the same university, told of the unity MRA had brought to their campus. "We were the bitterest political enemies on the campus," said Nelson. "What we had been doing was divisive and selfish. MRA united us. America needs this ideology. It is the only hope of our country." Johnson said: "We Negroes have often attempted to answer racial prejudice with an equal amount of prejudice against the whites. Our real battle is against prejudice and not against the people involved in it. The ideology of moral rearmament can answer racial prejudice because it challenges both black and white to change and build a new world."

WORLD DICTATORSHIP, WORLD DESTRUCTION, OR WORLD RENAISSANCE

Dr. Douglas Cornell of Washington, executive officer of the National Academy of Sciences, said: "MRA is the ideology of freedom needed in the atomic age. I have worked 10 years in the development of weapons and have some knowledge of such facts

as the marriage of atomic warheads with guided missiles. The new factor is that the next war would mean total destruction. Consciously or unconsciously everyone of us chooses one of three alternatives—world dictatorship, world destruction, or world renaissance. MRA offers every man the chance to play his full part in the creation of this renaissance."

Dante Calma of the office of the President of the Philippines, said: "As yet it is only in Communist countries that ideology is placed before self-interest. I fear for the future of my country and my children if there is not a change. Moral Re-Armament has proved a turning point in my life and for the first time I have become part of my Catholic faith. The future of this country as well as of Asia is being shaped here at this assembly. We Filipinos must make Moral Re-Armament top priority."

Dean Vincente G. Sinco, dean of the College of Law, University of the Philippines, and chairman of the import-export committee, told the assembly: "I have been overwhelmed by the decisions which men and women have made at this Assembly to take this ideology to Asia and the world. The spirit of greed, falsehood, impurity, and selfishness exists even where there is no communism. With MRA these forces will not become dominant in our nation. Only in this way will we have peace and unity."

Rajaram Shastri, Member of Parliament of India and General Secretary, 1954-55, of the All-India Hind Mazdoor Sabha, central organization of the Socialist trade unions of India with 500,000 members, declared:

"As a Marxist I spent 26 years of my life organizing the Indian working class on a basis of hatred and bitterness. When I saw the division around me I traveled for an answer to Soviet Russia, Red China, and several countries of Europe, but everywhere I found people suffering from the same disease—materialism."

"When I met Moral Re-Armament I realized that for 26 years I had been pointing out the mistakes of others instead of seeing where I need to change myself first. MRA turned a torchlight inward. Through absolute moral standards and the guidance of God lies the way to bring peace and happiness to individuals, families, nations, and the world."

Cornelio Balmaceda, general manager of the Philippine Chamber of Commerce and former Minister of Commerce, who had earlier attended the World Training Center for Moral Re-Armament at Caux, Switzerland, while a delegate to the ECOSOC Conference in Geneva, said: "Ideological controversy plagued the meetings in Geneva. At Caux I saw Communists changing and the force of an idea to unite the world. Most

solutions center around material rearmament. MRA is an armament that does not cost nations billions to insure defense. While the masses of Asia are being serenaded by communism, the coming of Moral Re-Armament is very significant and timely."

TRUE BASIS FOR EAST-WEST UNITY

In a cable to Mr. SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on the occasion of a private showing for Members of both Houses of the United States Congress of the all-African film, Freedom, delegates at the Asian Assembly said:

"The Asian nations gathered at Baguio in the Philippines respond to your initiative in the presentation of the film, Freedom, to the United States Congress. The Asian premiere of Freedom was seen here this week by delegates from 24 nations attending the Asian Assembly for Moral Re-Armament. This overwhelming film is providential for our nations at this critical time and must reach the millions of Asia now."

"The ideology depicted in the film, Freedom, is the ideology Asia wants. It is the only true basis on which East and West can unite. Where diplomacy has failed to answer our greatest need, Moral Re-Armament is succeeding. It is breaking down barriers of hate and bitterness and creating trust and unity. It is opening up avenues to reparations and concrete accords."

"We are grateful for the three American brothers, the Colwells, who responded to the late President Magsaysay's call that they come to Baguio. They have played a vital part in operating the spirit in which unity is being forged between our nations."

The cable was signed by: Senator Roseller T. Lim, the Philippines; General Ho Ying-chin, chairman, Military Strategy Advisory Board, Formosa; Niro Hoshijima, senior member, Japanese Diet; Senator Shidzue Kato, member, Foreign Relations Committee, Japan; Yoon Sung Soon, chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, Korean National Assembly; R. P. Sunarto, director, Radio Indonesia; Devar Surya Sena, Radio Ceylon; Dato Mahmud Bin Mat, former speaker, Legislative Council, Malaya; Maung Maung Khin, editor, New Light of Burma; Rajaram Shastri, Member of Parliament, India.

A special showing for members of Congress of the Philippines was held on April 13 and attended by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Senate majority leader, chairman of the three Senate committees, and other Congressional leaders. The morning session of the Senate was delayed for an hour to enable members to attend.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 16, 1957

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, strong to save, all that we think or plan or do this sacred week has upon it the shadow of a rugged cross. With a surety that pure reason cannot follow, because it passeth understanding, we are conscious that in the face of man's best man, love's best love, as He moves with unshrinking, steady pace to the cross-crowned hill outside the city's walls, is the confirmation of our highest aspirations, the rebuke to our failure to be true to our best, the shining goal of

a self uncowed by the threats of foes or compromised by the seduction of friends:

We take, O cross, thy shadow
For our abiding place,
We ask no other sunshine
Than the sunshine of His face;
Content to let the world go by,
To know no gain or loss,
Our sinful selves our only shame,
Our glory all the cross.

In His name, who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross and despised the shame. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 15, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

- S. 58. An act for the relief of Duk Chang Cho;
- S. 87. An act for the relief of Pavel Blahor;
- S. 91. An act for the relief of Victor Charles Hunt;
- S. 127. An act for the relief of Anna Maria Cosentino and Francesca Maria Cosentino;
- S. 158. An act for the relief of Hewey Malachi Mackey;